

JPRS-TAC-85-008

9 May 1985

# Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

9 May 1985

## WORLDWIDE REPORT

### ARMS CONTROL

#### GENERAL

Ottawa Support, Criticism of Air Defense Agreement With U.S. (Various sources, various dates) .....	1
Clark: No Star Wars Link, by Charlotte Montgomery	1
Nielsen: Full Canadian Sovereignty, by Joe O'Donnell	2
Mulroney: No Nuclear Weapons, by Patrick Nagle	4
Clark: No Nuclear Planes	5
CDA Divided on Dutch Role in NATO Nuclear Tasks (J. M. Bik; NRC HANDELSBLAD, 1 Apr 85) .....	6

#### U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

Reagan Statements on Talks, MX, SDI Called 'Joke' (V. Chernyshev; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 4 Apr 85) .....	8
U.S. Said To Prepare To Blame USSR if Geneva Talks Fail (TASS, 3 Apr 85) .....	10
Disputes in U.S. Over Approach To USSR Assessed (G. Vasilyev; PRAVDA, 8 Apr 85) .....	12
U.S. Arms Policies in Light of Talks Cause 'Alarm' (Vladimir Katin; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 4 Apr 85) .....	16
Gorbachev Discusses Talks With Socialist International Group (PRAVDA, 23 Mar 85) .....	19
Gorbachev Threatens To Break Off Talks if 'Arms Race' Continues (M. S. Gorbachev; PRAVDA, 24 Apr 85) .....	22

Weekly Discussion Shows View Progress of Talks (Moscow Domestic Service, 29, 31 Mar 85; Moscow Television Service, 30 Mar 85) .....	27
'International Situation' 29 March, by Vyacheslav Lavrentyev	27
'Studio 9' 30 March, by Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin	29
'International Observers Roundtable' 31 March, by Gennadiy Ivanovich Gerasimov	38
Further Commentaries on Continuing Progress of Talks (Various sources, various dates) .....	42
U.S., Soviet Approaches Contrasted, by Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, et al.	42
U.S. 'Far From Realistic', by Boris Kotov	47
Matveyev Commentary, by Vikentiy Matveyev	49
PRAVDA Comment, by B. Dubrovin	51
Comments on Arms Control During Clark Visit to USSR (Various sources, various dates) .....	55
Talks Begin	55
Gromyko Speech at Luncheon	55
Clark Speech at Luncheon	56
TASS Press Conference Report	57
AFP Press Conference Report	58
Mulroney Reports Remarks to Gorbachev on Geneva Talks (David Vienneau; THE TORONTO STAR, 15 Mar 85) .....	59
Lomeyko, Anatoliy Gromyko View How Talks Will Affect Europe (Cologne Westdeutscher Rundfunk Television Network, 25 Mar 85) .....	61
New Zealand MP: Nuclear Stand May Affect Geneva Talks (Douglas Graham; THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD, 11 Mar 85) .....	67

#### SPACE ARMS

Weekly International Affairs Surveys View SDI (PRAVDA, 7 Apr 85; Moscow Domestic Service, 7 Apr 85) .....	69
PRAVDA Review 7 April, by Yuriy Khalanov	69
Observers Roundtable 7 April, by Rudolf Georgiyevich	71
PRAVDA's Zhukov Denies Defensive Aims of SDI (Yuriy Zhukov; PRAVDA, 30 Mar 85) .....	74
Opposition to SDI Within U.S. Noted (Various sources, various dates) .....	78
U.S. Internal Criticism	78



Sagan, Perle Clash, by G. Vasilyev	79
Reagan Rejects Compromise	80
Rep Brown Voices 'Serious Worry'	80
Senator Kerry for Test Moratorium	80
U.S. Pressure on Allies To Support SDI Discussed (Various sources, various dates) .....	81
Mnatsakanov Commentary	81
Chernyshev Commentary	82
U.S. Seeks Research Help, by Sergey Vishnevskiy	83
'Frightening Prospect'	84
W. European Fears Stressed, by Eduard Mnatsakanov	85
NATO Nuclear Group's Support	85
Bogachev Comments	86
PRAVDA Review 31 March, by Vladimir Mikhaylov	87
'Space Noose' for Allies, by V. Kuzar	89
Weinberger Visits France	90
French Resistance Noted, by Yu. Kovalenko	91
U.S. Pressures France, Spain	92
FRG Agrees To Participate	92
Schmidt Criticism Cited	93
Anatoliy Gromyko on Dutch Attitude	93
Japan Studying Participation	94
Further Coverage of Allied Reactions to SDI Proposal (Various sources, various dates) .....	95
Carrington Voices Fears	95
West European Concern, by Eduard Mnatsakanov	95
Israel Planning To Participate, by Igor Charikov	96
Israeli Opposition Statement	97
Further Commentaries View SDI, Geneva Talks (PRAVDA, 17, 21 Mar 85; TASS, various dates) .....	98
SDI Contradicts Talks Agreement, by Tomas Kolesnichenko	98
Brochure on SDI Critiqued, by G. Vasilyev	101
'Delirious Plans'	104
U.S. Stance Ignores Accord	104
U.S. Seeks To 'Penetrate' Shield	105
End to Preparations Urged	106
French Views on SDI, Nuclear Deterrence Examined (NEUE ZUERCHER ZEITUNG, 9 Mar 85) .....	108
Canada's NRC President Doubts Star Wars Can Be Purely Defensive (Maira Farrow; THE SUN, 22 Mar 85) .....	112

Possibility of Canadian Star Wars Research Involvement Discussed (Various sources, various dates) .....	114
Mulroney on Job Creation, by Charlotte Montgomery	114
Mulroney, Opposition Leaders	115
Cruise Tests Link, by Peter Goodspeed	116
Present Research Projects	117
'Inconsistencies' Seen in Carrington's Oslo Speech (Alois Tomasek; Prague Domestic Service, 16 Apr 85) .....	119

#### SALT/START ISSUES

Reagan Hit for Linking MX Funding, Arms Talks (Various sources, various dates) .....	121
Pressure on Congress, by Nikolay Turkatenko	121
'Absurd Slogan'	122
Peace Committee Official, by Genrikh Borovik	123
Reagan Meets Journalists	125
Kampelman Summoned to Lobby	126
Kampelman's 'Contradictory Tasks'	126
U.S. Aims Questioned	127
'Trump Card' at Geneva, by Aleksandr Zholkver	128
Falin Views Pressure on Congress, by Valentin Falin	129
House Debate Opens	132
Kampelman Role Criticized	133
Reagan Thanks Congressmen	134
Reagan Statements 'Demagogic, Insincere', by Igor Fesunencko	134
<b>Briefs</b>	
U.S.-USSR Standing Consultative Commission Meets	136

#### INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Gorbachev Letter of Reply to FRG Peace Activists (TASS, 28 Mar 85) .....	137
U.S. Reactions to SS-20 Deployment Moratorium Noted (Various sources, various dates) .....	139
U.S. Answer 'Hasty,' 'Strange', by Igor Fesunencko	139
Congressmen Urge U.S. Moratorium	139
Official Washington	140
McFarlane's NBC Interview, by Georgiy Alekseyev	141
Senator Hart	141
U.S., Foreign Mass Media	141
BBC Report of SS-20 Deployments in GDR Denied (V. Pustov; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 10 Apr 85) .....	144

Tindemans Defends INF Deployment, Views Dutch Position (Leo Tindemans Interview; ELSEVIERS WEEKBLAD, 30 Mar 85)	145
CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE	
Results of Recent Stockholm CDE Session Summed Up (Various sources, various dates) .....	152
Grinevskiy Interview	152
Grinevskiy Press Briefing	153
Further on Press Briefing	154
IZVESTIYA Commentary, by A. Sychev	155
PRAVDA Commentary, by M. Kostikov	156
CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT	
Israelyan, Other Delegates Quoted on Space, Chemical Arms (TASS, 4 Apr 85) .....	160
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS	
Tenth Anniversary of CBW Convention Noted (TASS, 9 Apr 85) .....	161
NUCLEAR -FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS	
USSR Army Paper Urges North Europe Nuclear-Free Zone (D. Pogorzhelskiy; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 20 Mar 85) .....	163
NUCLEAR TESTING	
U.S. Continues Nuclear Testing Despite UN Appeal (TASS, 9 Apr 85) .....	166
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Denies Test Ban Violations (A. Fedorov; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 23 Mar 85) .....	167

GENERAL

OTTAWA SUPPORT, CRITICISM OF AIR DEFENSE AGREEMENT WITH U.S.

Clark: No Star Wars Link

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 8 Mar 85 p 8

[Article by Charlotte Montgomery]

[Text]

OTTAWA — External Affairs Minister Joe Clark denied yesterday that any connection exists or is planned between the radar warning system in Canada's North and President Ronald Reagan's Star Wars project.

News reports quoting Paul Nitze, the U.S. arms control negotiator, that suggested a possible connection were a surprise to both men and were "misleading," Mr. Clark told reporters after a Cabinet meeting.

The State Department in Washington and the U.S. Embassy in Ottawa distributed a statement yesterday from Mr. Nitze that also called the reports "misleading."

The statement said Mr. Nitze was "merely pointing out that the President's Strategic Defence Initiative (Star Wars) is a research project and that it is impossible at this time to predict what decisions will or will not be made at a considerably later date on any actual development or deployment."

It added that, "Canada and the United States have not discussed any expansion of the North warning system into an anti-ballistic missile defence system and no such discussions are planned."

The issue arose after Mr. Nitze met Prime Minister Brian Mulroney on Wednesday to brief him in advance of U.S.-Soviet arms controls talks. Mr. Nitze was asked by a reporter in Ottawa whether the

northern radar system in Canada would be tied to the Star Wars system, "if it ever went ahead."

"That remains to be seen," Mr. Nitze replied. "This is a research program that hasn't yet resulted in the development of specific systems."

Mr. Clark has had to deny repeatedly to opposition MPs that the northern radar warning system — which is to be modernized under an agreement expected to be announced when Mr. Reagan and Mr. Mulroney meet in Quebec on March 17 — is tied to the Star Wars program and to stress that it will not be.

"The fact is that the North warning system has to do with defence against certain kinds of intrusion not contemplated by the Strategic Defence Initiative," Mr. Clark said yesterday. "I repeat the point, there is absolutely no relation between the North warning system and the Strategic Defence Initiative."

Asked if a future link between the two systems were possible, Mr. Clark said, "I believe there cannot be any link in the future between the North warning system and the SDI because of the limited nature of the intrusions against which the North warning system protects Canada."

When he was asked whether Canada has requested a clarification

tion from Mr. Nitze of his remarks, Mr. Clark did not respond directly.

"I think Mr. Nitze was as surprised as I was by the misleading reports that appeared in Canadian media, and responded," Mr. Clark said.

The difficulty centred around the question asked, he said.

"I thought that the question that had been put was whether or not a system that might develop from SDI might require a radar warning system. That's what I thought he

was replying to. I think that's what he thought he was replying to. So, he and I were equally surprised by the reports, which we regard as being misleading, although, naturally, inadvertently so."

Earlier in the day, senior officials from External Affairs told reporters that the land-based radar system in Canada's North and a system in space aimed at anti-ballistic missiles were so fundamentally different that there could be no possible connection.

### Nielsen: Full Canadian Sovereignty

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 14 Mar 85 pp A1, A14

[Article by Joe O'Donnell]

[Text]

OTTAWA — Canada and the United States have reached agreement on a multi-billion dollar overhaul of North America's air defences, including the installation of a new northern radar system to replace the 30-year-old DFEW Line.

The agreement, tabled yesterday in the House of Commons, is to be formally signed Monday in Quebec city by Prime Minister Brian Mulroney and U.S. President Ronald Reagan at the conclusion of their so-called Shamrock Summit.

In unveiling the deal, Deputy Prime Minister Erskine Nielsen told the Commons the measures will give Canada full sovereignty over its territory and air space for the first time.

The agreement involves the establishment of a state-of-the-art warning system against enemy attack around the entire perimeter of the continental mainland of North America, capable of detecting all forms of approaching enemy aircraft and cruise missiles. It will be called the North Warning System.

#### Compensate communities

The total cost of the air defence overhaul will be \$7 billion, with the U.S. responsible for 88 per cent of it. Canada's share — about \$840 million — will go mainly toward the upgrading of the DFEW (Distant Early Warning) Line, a \$1.5 billion project.

Canada must also share in the cost of the dismantling of the obsolete Pinetree Line, a radar belt that stretches across the middle of the country. That cost includes

compensating communities affected by the shutdown, which will involve 17 of the 24 Pinetree stations.

Yesterday's announcement caught Parliament by surprise. While it has been known for months that Canada and the U.S. have been working on a new air defence deal, it had not been expected the finished product would be tabled before next Monday's signing ceremony.

Opposition critics immediately charged that the deal amounts to a clear endorsement by the Canadian government of the Reagan administration's so-called Star Wars space weapons scheme, which theoretically would knock down ballistic missiles.

#### Economic boost

But Nielsen steadfastly denied the system will have any link to Star Wars, known formally as the Strategic Defence Initiative.

Instead, Nielsen insisted the project offers tremendous economic benefits for Canada. The system will provide 11,500 jobs in

the communications and construction industries during the eight years it is being built, he said.

"The industrial benefits from this project will, at the very least, equal national expenditure on it," Nielsen said, adding that the project experience "will help open world markets for Canadian industry and for our highly skilled communications industry in particular."

The new radar network is described as a "new and improved" DFW Line. It will include a chain of 52 ground radar stations in locations spread across northern Alaska, the Canadian Arctic and the Labrador coast.

Among those stations will be 13 long-range and 39 short-range radars — most of them to be located in Canada and under Canadian control — designed to provide warning of bomber and cruise missile attacks from the Soviet Union.

That includes surveillance of transpolar cruise missile routes.

The government says the new microwave radars will provide coverage down to extremely low altitudes and will be far easier and less expensive to maintain than the existing system.

The new system is expected to be in operation by the early 1990s. The DFW Line was viewed as obsolete and far too costly to maintain or upgrade. It cost \$150 million a year to run.

Unlike the DFW Line, the new system will identify cruise missiles for interception by Canadian CF-18 fighters.

The other components of the modernization of the continent's air defences are over-the-horizon backscatter radars, to be located in the U.S., for surveillance of attacks from the east, west and south, plus airborne radar, provided by U.S. aircraft, to supplement the north system during a red alert.

The U.S. will foot the bill for those two programs.

The long-awaited deal, which follows nearly 10 years of review by the two countries, represents "an important step forward in ensuring that Canada can carry

out the responsibilities we share with the United States for the defence of North America," Nielsen said.

"The agreement . . . reflects the essence of the partnership between our two countries which share the continent — sovereign allies, independent neighbors and close friends."

While Nielsen insisted the pact is merely the formal signing of an agreement which was "99 per cent" completed by the former Liberal government, opposition critics called it a dramatic departure from previous Canadian defence policy.

They demanded guarantees the system will not be linked with Star Wars.

Liberal MP Lloyd Axworthy and New Democratic Party defence critic Pauline Jewett complained that the government had been too secretive during negotiations with the U.S. on the system.

Jewett demanded that any defence agreement with the U.S. include a clause stating clearly that Canada is in no way committed to participate in a ballistic missile defence system.

If such a clause is not included, Jewett said, it is like "saying to the whole Canadian public that the door is open to Canadian participation" in such a system.

External Affairs Minister Joe Clark said that since this is not the intention of the government, such a clause would be "redundant." And he accused opposition critics of a deliberate attempt "to sow fear in the country."

### **'Absolute tripe'**

Nielsen, who watched Jewett storm from the Commons in the middle of his answer, also reprimanded opposition critics. "I wish they would stop using their position to propagate that absolute tripe."

The new radars "are neither designed nor sited for the detection of ballistic missiles, or of any other events in space," Nielsen said. "That is an important distinction which many fail to make."

The long-range radars "will have essentially the same range of



surveillance as the existing radars of the DEW Line," he said. The difference is that they will incorporate "the most modern technology and they will provide information on the direction, height and speed of aircraft."

This will "permit Canadian Forces interceptor aircraft operating from northern airstrips to identify and control potential intruders."

#### Mulroney: No Nuclear Weapons

Vancouver THE SUN in English 19 Mar 85 p A11

[Article by Patrick Nagle]

[Text]

**QUEBEC** — Only the Canadian government can control nuclear weapons on Canadian soil, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney said Monday after promising again that cabinet would not accept such weapons from the United States.

"The position is clear cut," Mulroney said at a brief airport press conference before returning to Ottawa after meetings with U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

"There are no nuclear arms or weapons on Canadian territory or soil, nor shall there be during the tenure of this government," Mulroney said.

Then he underlined his position that only his government can control decisions on nuclear arms in this country: "We reserve, clearly for the cabinet, the government and the Parliament of Canada the right to make those decisions and we shall — no one else at any time, or in any circumstances."

During the visit of the U.S. president and members of his administration to the historic walled city of Que-

bec, conflicting statements from officials again raised the possibility of the U.S. using Canada as a base for anti missile defences against a potential Russian attack.

Reagan's defence secretary, Caspar Weinberger, aggravated Canadian observers when he said during a television interview Monday morning that the U.S. has contingency plans for Canadian defence sites.

Weinberger stressed he was answering hypothetical questions and that any such action by the U.S. would require Canadian government approval.

Although Weinberger said the U.S. might have to base land launched anti-cruise missile weapons in Canada, Mulroney rejected the possibility.

The prime minister also refuted speculation that Canada's support for Reagan's research on the Strategic Defence Initiative — popularly described as "Star Wars" — would automatically lead to Canadian acceptance of a developed system.

Clark: No Nuclear Planes

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 21 Mar 85 p A9

[Text]

OTTAWA (CP) — Any interceptor aircraft, based in northern Canada as part of a Canada-U.S. agreement, will be armed only with non-nuclear weapons, External Affairs Minister Joe Clark told the House of Commons yesterday.

Clark was responding to questions from Liberal Jean Chretien, who said the defence pact signed with the United States last weekend will create "a series of military air bases in the Canadian North without informing Canadians in advance."

Tuesday, Clark said the airstrips would be used by radar-carrying aircraft that will be part of an improved, \$1.5 billion radar upgrading plan to be shared with the United States.

But Chretien said the agreement clearly states Canada must improve northern landing sites for both interceptors and radar planes.

Clark conceded yesterday there are "two types of airstrips being affected in the North" — one for aircraft carrying radar and the other to prepare for the possibility that jet interceptors might be moved north in the event of a crisis.

But he said these aircraft, "not armed with nuclear weapons . . . carrying only conventional arms (would) go up into the North" only in the event of an alert.

Chretien suggested this could mean airplanes would be there on 24-hour-a-day alert, which amounts to "giving the Canadian territory to the American government for operational purposes."

But Clark said Chretien was "living in some kind of fantasy-land."

CSO: 3220/03



9 May 1985

## GENERAL

## CDA DIVIDED ON DUTCH ROLE IN NATO NUCLEAR TASKS

Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 1 Apr 85 p 3

[Article by editor J. M. Bik: "Nuclear Defense Task Divides CDA"]

[Text] The Hague, 1 Apr--In the summer of 1983, CDA Ministers Van den Broek (Foreign Affairs) and De Ruiter (Defense) had a sharp difference of opinion about the intended nuclear and financial levels of the Dutch contribution to NATO. This difference of opinion had the effect that the new defense budget, which had been approved, was issued only at the end of 1983.

Unlike De Ruiter, in the summer of 1983 Van den Broek did not want to go along with the NATO partners in an announcement that Holland: would henceforth raise the defense budget not by 3 percent per year, but rather by 2 (or 1) percent, that it wanted a drastic limitation of the existing (six) nuclear weapons missions and that it still had not adopted a position on the deployment of cruise missiles. Van den Broek knew he was supported in his opposition by the VVD faction in the Second Chamber, while De Ruiter knew that his reserved position vis-a-vis nuclear weapons (especially the cruise missiles and the tactical "battlefield weapons" of the army corps artillery) was shared by a large portion of the CDA faction.

The CDA's objections to the nuclear short-range weapons are being expressed in the current election campaign. They are also found, among other places, in a motion by J. De Boer which was adopted in spring 1979 with the support of the PvdA and D'66; this motion rejects a NATO request to provide nuclear capability to the 155 mm gun, in addition to (or in place of) the 203 mm gun of the First Army Corps.

Through the intercession of Prime Minister Lubbers, also CDA, the disagreement between the Christian Democratic ministers was resolved in such a way that ultimately NATO was not informed of any Dutch plans or decisions with regard to limiting nuclear weapons missions, but rather of "concerns" in preparing the defense budget, regarding which the allies could express their (predictably critical) views. And the prime minister also saw to it that Minister Ruding (Finance, also CDA) gave up any attempt to limit the annual increase in the defense budget to 1 percent.

Since then, as far as the Cabinet and government parties are concerned, the defense budget is to increase by 2 percent per year during current Cabinet term and by 3 percent during the period 1986-1990. The defense budget reflects

this as well. And it is also true that a decision as to the number of Dutch nuclear weapons is to be made only after the issue of whether cruise missiles are to be deployed in Holland. As has been known since 1 June 1984, this question will be answered on 1 November of this year. If the Soviet Union has installed more than 378 operational SS-20s and if there is no arms control agreement with the United States concerning such systems, then (in 1988) Holland will deploy 88 cruise missiles.

The Dutch decision of 1 June 1984 regarding the deployment of cruise missiles is not, however, the only thing to occur since the summer of 1983. The reason is that at the Ministry of Defense (former Minister of Justice) De Ruiter and his advisors were not idle; this had the effect that the minister modified slightly his view on (the possibility of) limiting tactical nuclear weapons. He gave some insight into this in the fall of 1983 by pledging, in front of his NATO colleagues in Montebello in Canada, "extensive" support to the premises of a study by NATO commander Rogers. In this study Rogers is supposed to determine ways in which the arsenal of tactical nuclear warheads in Western Europe can be reduced from 6,000 to 4,000 by 1988 at the latest. Please note: Rogers' task applied to nuclear warheads, not the nuclear weapons missions themselves.

This latter point is of importance for two reasons. First: the number of "Dutch" nuclear warheads is comparatively small. Second: in the operations area in West Germany, the Dutch First Army Corps has no more than eight pieces of nuclear artillery (203 mm, range about 10 kilometers). Nearby (German and American) units have greater nuclear artillery capability (including 155 mm guns) which is mainly intended to deter the formation of Warsaw Pact troop concentrations.

Last week, after meeting with NATO colleagues in Luxemburg, Minister De Ruiter concurred (a word to the wise is sufficient) by saying that with respect to the Rogers plan the intent "by no means" was to eliminate nuclear artillery. Indeed, it is known that the Rogers study pertains not only to the limitation but also to the modernization of nuclear warheads. In the case of the artillery, this involves increasing the range to 32 kilometers (for the 155 mm gun). This would make it possible to move the guns further behind the front lines and, according to the minister, to respond to worries about the risk of premature use of nuclear weapons on too low a decision-making level, the so-called predelegation problem.

Early last month, in the Second Chamber the CDA faction refused to join the PvdA to reconfirm the rejection of nuclear capability for the 155 mm gun. The reason for this greater degree of caution was that the decision about the other nuclear weapons missions would be made only after, and in conjunction with, the cruise missile decision on 1 November. Outside of the Chamber, in an interview (see the Saturday edition), expert J. De Boer was willing to go even further on his own: the nuclear artillery mission must eventually be eliminated. It is not possible for De Ruiter and De Boer both to get their way. Anyone betting on the outcome should put his money on De Ruiter.

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

REAGAN STATEMENTS ON TALKS, MX, SDI CALLED 'JOKE'

PM041609 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Apr 85 First Edition p 3

["International Remarks" by Colonel of the Reserve V. Chernyshev: "Sinister Deception"]

[Text] The world has just experienced the first day of April. People in many countries like to play practical jokes on the acquaintances, friends, and colleagues on this day. These jokes are normally inoffensive and the humor is treated lightly and merrily. There are, however, some "jokers" who do not observe the unwritten April Fool's rules, and who do not even wait for that day to display their black "humor." All the world knows, for example, of U.S. President R. Reagan's "joke" during a television voice test, which was not even remotely like an April Fool's joke. The debates which took place over the last few days in the U.S. Congress on appropriations for the building of a second batch of 21 MX ICBM's were also distinguished, as THE NEW YORK TIMES aptly put it, by a kind of "April Fool logic" applied by the administration which claimed that more of these first-strike missiles must be built for the sake of reducing nuclear weapons in the world. Some "jokes!"

J. Wright, majority leader in the House of Representatives, declared at the conclusion of the debate: "We are spending more funds on armaments and military might this year than were spent in any year during the Vietnam war, in any year during the Korean war, and of course, in any year during World War II." The White House "jokers" are cynically trying to exploit the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons to justify the build-up of the U.S. military machine and strategic nuclear potential. In line with its "logic," official Washington claims that the development of new first-strike weapons is supposedly a necessary element of U.S. strategy, since it...will increase the chances of reaching agreement with the Soviet Union.

This "logic," which became part of the White House arsenal a long time ago, makes it possible to be, as it is fashionable to say in Washington, "highly flexible": initially to convince congressmen of the need to deploy MX missiles because supposedly "there are no Russians at the negotiating table," and a year later, without a hint of embarrassment, to insist on the very same deployment because, they say, "the Russians are sitting at the negotiating table."

Everyone recalls how, a week before 1 April 1983, President R. Reagan delivered a speech advancing the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative," envisaging the creation of a large-scale ABM defense system with space-based components. The administration chief declared that this "initiative" will supposedly hasten the strengthening of stability, will "deprive nuclear weapons of their powers," and will render them "obsolete." According to THE NEW YORK TIMES, this speech took even some of the President's advisers unawares, while some old hands in the Pentagon asked one another: "What the hell is this -- this strategic defense?" This amazement was, of course, clearly put on. The "initiative," which acquired the more accurate title of "star wars" program, is accurately "combined" with the course of attaining military superiority. Having failed to disrupt the strategic equilibrium on earth to its own advantage, Washington has decided to do so in space. Its basic scheme consists of attempts to ensure the opportunity of using with impunity the "nuclear sword" that "cannot be parried" and give a "new ring" to the strategy of being the first to deliver a nuclear strike.

Some other American official spokesmen also like to "joke." For example, in his desire to convince the U.S. allies to follow the course of the militarization of space, P. Nitze, consultant to the U.S. President and secretary of state, speaking recently at London's International Institute for Strategic Studies, declared that the large-scale ABM defense system with space-based components will supposedly be deployed only if its "invulnerability" is proved. Therefore, don't be afraid, allies, it may be that nothing dangerous will happen. But, do invest some cash in the "research."

And here we have a clear lack of coordination: One advocate of "star wars" gives assurances that the system will be deployed only when it is "invulnerable," while the other claims that it will be deployed in any case, while constantly expanding and improving the invulnerability of its components. Thus, Washington's official spokesmen confirm that the United States is striving to extend the arms race to a new sphere -- other space.

The spirit of the first of April is obviously also contained in the President's claims that he is allegedly prepared to share U.S. technology in the ABM sphere with the Soviet Union. But the White House Chief has again placed his advisers and ministers in a difficult situation. The Pentagon feels particularly embittered. Defense Secretary Weinberger, answering a question put by the French newspaper LE MONDE, openly declared: "We have nothing against sharing with our allies. What we don't want is sharing with the Soviet Union." Afterwards, obviously recalling the presidential "humor" and the approach of 1 April, the Pentagon chief suddenly remembered, and "explained" that the President's promise will supposedly "become effective" only after "the systems have been fully developed."

The U.S. Administration's "April Fool logic" is aimed at simpletons; it is aimed at, as Britain's the OBSERVER graphically put it, camouflaging gun barrels with olive branches. The U.S. Administration is stubbornly trying to impress on the American people and its allies that security can be consolidated not by means of effective and honest talks leading to the mutual reduction of nuclear arms but by developing and deploying fundamentally new and increasingly dangerous weapons. This is not a joke but the most ambitious deception of the nuclear age, a deception fraught with danger for all mankind.

CSO: 5200/1089

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

U.S. SAID TO PREPARE TO BLAME USSR IF GENEVA TALKS FAIL

LD032129 Moscow TASS in English 2102 GMT 3 Apr 85

[Text] Moscow April 3 TASS--By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev:

American administration officials are ever more often resorting to invented and simply absurd arguments in a bid to divert world public attention from their extremely unconstructive approach to the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments. It seems that some quarters in Washington are interested in preparing "groundwork" for the allegations that it is the Soviet Union that would be responsible for the absence of positive results in Geneva.

Precisely that follows, for instance, from the claims by Edward Rowny, special consultant to the President and the secretary of state, that the USSR resorts to criticism of the "star wars" project as a ploy to lead the Geneva talks away from their chief and immediate objective--that of reducing nuclear armaments. Mr Rowny deliberately "forgets" the joint Soviet-American statement which sets out clearly that the talks will be examined and handled in their interrelationship. He also disregards the agreed upon objective of the talks--elaboration of effective accords directed at preventing an arms race in outer space and terminating it on earth, at limiting and reducing nuclear armaments, at strengthening strategic stability.

To be serious, it is hard for any sober-minded person even to imagine the possibility of so "free" interpretation of facts. The facts show that while continuing the buildup of nuclear armaments, Washington is not going to scrap its work on militarizing outer space, the work which poses a risk of a sharp disruption of strategic stability.

It is surprising that the person who gives advice to the U.S. President should totally ignore the Soviet leadership's repeated firm declarations about its readiness for large reductions of nuclear armaments, for the adoption of most radical decisions at the talks. It is totally unclear how this is possible that the arms expert with the rank of lieutenant general should ignore the military-strategic essence of the matter--the objective and permanent interrelationship between offensive and defensive weapons, which are, besides, being transferred into a totally new sphere--outer space. Knowledgeable arms experts in the United States hold that the space-based antimissile defence system to be developed under the "star wars" project is not a "shield," but a supplement to the first-strike potential, while its deployment would greatly destabilize the strategic situation.



Well, one should not be surprised at all. Official Washington has since long ignored realities and elementary logic. To take, for instance, the U.S. President's repeated pronouncements about the U.S. alleged military "lag" and the need to "catch up" with the USSR. Such declarations, justly wrote THE NEW YORK TIMES, amount to nonsense. Talking about nuclear forces alone, the United States added 5,000 nuclear warheads to its arsenal in the seventies. All components of the offensive nuclear forces were perfected within the framework of the large-scale programme of "America's rearmament," proclaimed by Ronald Reagan.

The production and development of six new types of strategic offensive weapons--MX missiles, Midgetman mobile missiles, new submarine-based Trident 2 missiles, two new types of heavy bombers and long-range cruise missiles are continuing.

In order to justify its unprecedented militarist preparations, the U.S. administration resorts to malicious slander vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. The Pentagon has just issued a fresh edition of its booklet "Soviet Military Power," whose authors seek to demonstrate the alleged growing military threat posed by the Soviet Union. They have decided to ascribe to the Soviet Union what the United States itself is doing to spiral the arms race in a bid to disrupt the existing strategic parity and gain military superiority over the USSR.

It is rather indicative that a highly placed White House official, describing the "growth of the Soviet military threat" at a press conference launching the Pentagon's booklet, when asked if he would exchange the American Armed Forces for those of the Soviet Union, said he preferred the Armed Forces of the United States and its allies. This shows the value of all the prattling and "argumentation."

It is impossible to accord the incompatible--to work out agreements on arms reduction and simultaneously build up armaments at a rapid pace. According to well-known American news analyst James Reston, the U.S. administration has a strategy of war, but does not have a strategy of peace. That explains everything, that is why American officials maneuver and advance absurd "arguments."

CSO: 5200/1064

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

DISPUTES IN U.S. OVER APPROACH TO USSR ASSESSED

PMC91015 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Apr 85 First Edition p 6

[Article by G. Vasilyev, PRAVDA correspondent: "USSR-United States: A Time of Decisions"]

[Text] Washington, April -- Soviet-American relations, both in terms of general problems and as regards their concrete day-to-day manifestations, have always been on the front pages of the newspapers here and at the center of political debates. At present the state of these relations and their prospects are attracting particularly great public attention. There are several reasons for this. There was tremendous interest here in the results of the CPSU Central Committee Extraordinary March Plenum and the confirmation that the Soviet Union invariably advocates constructive East-West dialogue and practical measures leading to the lessening of international tension and to lasting peace. The Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments begun in Geneva have aroused hopes among broad circles of the U.S. public that it will be possible to achieve success in the main avenue which concerns the destiny of the whole world -- that of curbing the nuclear arms race on earth and preventing it in space. Lastly, the process which has gathered speed in the United States itself of reinterpreting the results of the last 4 years of Republican rule is making people think about the question of what the future American policy toward the Soviet Union should be.

At a recent Washington reception I was able to conduct a kind of public opinion poll, which was all the more interesting in that the people interviewed were well-known American figures. "How do you assess the state of Soviet-American relations and their prospects?" I asked them. Former U.S. presidential candidate G. McGovern expressed concern that the arms race has speeded up in recent years. He was particularly alarmed by the space militarization program elaborated by the U.S. Administration. "I am resolutely opposed to the 'star wars' plans," McGovern said. "I believe their implementation, far from strengthening our security, will actually make the threat of nuclear catastrophe even more menacing. I hope our countries will find a mutually acceptable solution to this problem and avert a dangerous turn of events."

The important lawyer and former Senator William Fulbright believes that, in their attitude toward the USSR, American leaders are hampered, as he put it, by "anticommunist paranoia" and the refusal to grasp the fact that however great its hostility toward the socialist system, the United States is not capable of dominating the world. "And yet," he went on, "the Americans and the Russians have no territorial claims against each other and no history of military conflicts, unless you count the brief episode of American intervention in northern Russia soon after the October Revolution" I found an unexpected note of optimism in the views of Arthur (Macy Cox), a well-known specialist on questions of Soviet-American relations and strategic problems and the author of a book which opens the readers' eyes to the reality of the threat of a nuclear apocalypse. "Yes," he said, "the situation is extremely dangerous, but I am optimistic about the future. The main thing is that in our nuclear missile age war has become obsolete as a means of resolving international conflicts. There can be no winner in a nuclear war. I hope that all responsible statesmen will ultimately recognize this fact."

The replies of well-known Americans who have gained wisdom through life and knowledge revealed dissatisfaction with the present state of affairs and expressed the opinion that in recent years Soviet-American relations have been going downhill fast.

It is true that at the end of the seventies and the beginning of the eighties the beneficial process of relaxation of international tension was disrupted. This began under J. Carter's administration. Let us recall that it was during his rule that the ratification of the SALT II Treaty was blocked and the decision was adopted at the NATO session in Brussels to site American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe. However, the opponents of peaceful coexistence and cooperation really "rolled up their sleeves" and set about their task after the Republicans came to power.

Under the influence of the Soviet Union's policy of initiative and under pressure from the peace-loving public, the Soviet-American talks finally began in Geneva. Their aim is to elaborate effective accords aimed at preventing an arms race in space, stopping the arms race on earth, bringing about nuclear arms limitation and reduction, and strengthening strategic stability. This aim enjoys the support of everyone who is at all sensible. Of course, success along this path will largely determine whether a breakthrough for the better will take place in USSR-U.S. relations and whether they will once again be built on a reasonable foundation of peaceful coexistence, equality, and identical security of the sides.

However, with the passage of time, many reasons are emerging for sensible Americans to feel fear and concern. Now that an important, complex search for mutually acceptable accords has begun in Geneva, you would think it is in the sides' duty to display restraint in word and deed. But this very period has been chosen for intensive militarist indoctrination of the public, and first and foremost the U.S. Congress, with the aim of ensuring that the highest legislative body passes extensive programs for "rearming America."

The argument which is being used here to justify this course of action is also giving the Americans cause for concern. In public speeches delivered practically every day, the U.S. President, the defense secretary, and the head of the American delegation to the talks, who was specially recalled from Geneva, have tried to show that the senators and congressmen should "demonstrate the unity and determination of the nations" because without a decision to produce a new consignment of first-strike strategic missiles, the Soviet Union will supposedly "have no incentive" to reach agreement at the talks.

It must also cause concern that American officials are still talking stubbornly about their intentions of continuing to prepare for "star wars."



Many people in the United States and Europe are asking whether this is not an attempt to surreptitiously remove the question of preventing the militarization of near-earth space from the field of talks and possible practical solutions in Geneva. Yet, it is well known that all three spheres at the Geneva talks must be regarded as closely interconnected under the Soviet-American accord. Not for nothing are the most skeptical observers asking: "Does not this position conceal the intention of turning the Geneva talks into a kind of smokescreen to cover the further acceleration of the arms race?"

A close examination of the debates in Washington reveals that the dispute over questions of the Republican administration's policy in its second term is also affecting the ranks of conservative forces on which the administration relies. The other day I was at a symposium organized by the extreme right "think tank," the Heritage Foundation. The agenda was succinctly formulated: "Does the United States need the SALT II Treaty?" The answer given by the foundation's representative and by the invited specialists, among them Colin Gray, the theorist of "limited nuclear war," was as succinct as the question: "No, it does not need it." Basically, the extreme right-wing "thinkers" are against nearly all existing and possible Soviet-American accords on arms limitation because they fetter the activity of the U.S. military-industrial complex and hinder the deployment of the latest weapons systems.

The Heritage Foundation is one of the influential extreme right organizations pushing the U.S. Administration even further to the right. In its report "Mandate for Leadership-2," issued on the eve of Reagan's second inauguration as President and delivered to all government offices, this organization set forth 1,300 proposals for the administration's new term -- from measures aimed at further cutting social programs and entirely "emancipating" capital from the "fetters" of state control, to a foreign policy program whose pivot is the still more energetic buildup of armaments and the curtailment of all arms control talks.

But I have before me another survey of the same range of questions, created within a conservative organization which is equally close to the administration -- the American Business Institute. Here "pragmatism" is the watchword. Calling on the administration to base its policy toward the USSR on "pragmatic, not ideological considerations," the authors of the surveys published in the latest issue of the institute's journal acknowledge that "U.S. attempts to dispute the Soviet Union's status as a military superpower are unproductive and dangerous." They call on the administration to preserve the accords reached earlier, including those set forth in the SALT II Treaty, to hold talks to elaborate new mutually acceptable solutions, and to "display restraint" in the sphere of plans to deploy space systems.

These two collectives of recommendations spring from conservative and radical conservative forces. Despite the common hostility toward socialism which unites them, the differences of approach are obvious. In the first instance there is reckless emphasis on military force, regardless of the cost and heedless of the dangers; in the second, there is recognition of the realities of our age and a readiness, while upholding the interests of American capitalism, to move toward talks and compromises.

People here have recently been speaking of Washington's desire to seek an improvement in Soviet-American relations on a broad range of questions. A natural and promising thing, you would think, provided that Washington can rid itself of the idea that relations with the Soviet Union can be built on a "position of strength."

"The need for mutual understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union has never been more insistent than it is now. Our country's worried citizens have observed with alarm how relations with the USSR have deteriorated, reaching possibly the lowest point since the end of World War II. Congress shares the Americans' concern. It is quite obvious that we must find ways of improving relations with the Soviet Union and work for a more peaceful existence," Congressman John Seiberling writes in a foreword to a "Congress round table" report. These words reflect the mood of millions of Americans.

Many people here believe that 1985 offers certain opportunities for Soviet-U.S. relations to return to a healthy atmosphere of peaceful coexistence. This would have tremendous positive consequences not only for the two countries' peoples, but for the whole world. This will be possible when Washington renounces the approach which Fulbright called the "recklessness of strength," rids itself of its anticommunist illusions, and looks reality soberly in the face.

CSO: 5200/1084

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### U.S. ARMS POLICIES IN LIGHT OF TALKS CAUSE 'ALARM'

PM071313 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Apr 85 First Edition p 1

[Vladimir Katin "International Review": "Dialogue for Peace"]

[Text] The new Soviet-American talks in Geneva on space and nuclear arms are being held behind closed doors. However, the purpose of the talks -- the goals set by the USSR and the United States -- is well known. One of the main goals is the complete exclusion of nuclear weapons from arsenals.

The positions from which the sides began the Geneva dialogue in the middle of March are also well known. Our country does not seek military superiority; it wants to stop the arms race and proposes freezing nuclear arsenals, halting further missile deployment, and elaborating effective accords to prevent the militarization of space.

The United States, in keeping with the accord reached on the subject of the talks and its leaders' statements, has also sent its delegation to Geneva with the apparent intention of ending the arms race. However, we will judge the American side's real intentions by its practical actions rather than its words and statements. At the same time, we are firmly opposed to the talks becoming any kind of screen for further accelerating the arms race.

One cannot fail to notice that the number of medium-range nuclear weapons in West Europe was markedly increased soon after the Geneva talks began. Sixteen cruise missiles were hastily delivered to Belgium and brought into combat readiness, targeted on installations in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

Medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe also figure on the Geneva talks' agenda. The question is: Why ship them to the continent with such frantic haste if talks on a future reduction are already in progress? Moreover, the additional new lethal arrows in NATO's quiver can only complicate the situation in Geneva and pile up new obstacles.

It is our conviction that for the talks to show progress, it is necessary to take effective measures to apply firm brakes to the arms race, rather than building up arms. Recently, in conversation with the leaders of the Socialist International's Consultative Disarmament Council, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed, "we are convinced, in particular, that a stop to the deployment of new American missiles in Europe with a simultaneous stop to the buildup of Soviet counter-measures would help considerably to solve the whole range of questions being discussed in Geneva."

However, what has been taking place in the United States since the talks began cannot fail to cause alarm. The United States is now showing considerable, or more precisely, increased military-political activeness and a desire to deploy as many of its nuclear weapons as possible. Washington's desire to crush as many countries as possible beneath its nuclear heel is clear. Recently, for example, at a NATO session in Luxembourg the U.S. representatives twisted the arms of the Netherlands delegates, demanding that they accept a consignment of nuclear missiles. A report about America's intention of storing 48 nuclear depth charges in Iceland agitated the whole of that country. The American press has published reports on Pentagon plans to site nuclear weapons on military bases in Spain and the Azores. Similar plans for the shipment of nuclear munitions also exist for Canada, the Bermudas, Puerto Rico, and other countries.

What do these plans indicate? Unfortunately, they cannot be in any way categorized as "peace initiatives" or defensive measures. This is clear preparation for nuclear war — the Pentagon's ambition to have the maximum number of nuclear explosives allows no other interpretation.

Our country adopts a fundamentally different stance on all these nuclear arms questions. Thus, the USSR assumed a commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons even before the talks began. All that the United States needed to do was follow our example and the international situation would have brightened and improved. We have frequently called on the United States to resume and finalize talks to stop all nuclear weapons tests. However, its response to this has been to continue improving the destructive power of these weapons. The USSR is in favor of nuclear-free zones in all parts and regions of the world. The United States, on the contrary, seeks to turn the whole world into stores and depots for its nuclear missiles, landmines, and bombs. There has been no response to our proposal that the nuclear powers freeze all their nuclear armaments both qualitatively and quantitatively. We should like to point out that all these Soviet initiatives still remain in force today and that they can be really translated into the language of specific accords if the United States adopts a realistic stance.

Only two powers, the USSR and the United States, are taking part in the talks in Geneva. However, the West European countries, for their part, could also help them succeed by creating an appropriate atmosphere both on the continent and in the world as a whole. They could contribute to this noble cause not only by refusing to site additional nuclear arms in their countries but also by committing themselves to a firm stance on the question of space militarization. A number of prominent politicians in France, Britain, and Spain have already expressed themselves in favor of a peaceful outer space, and Denmark and Greece have dissociated themselves from America's aggressive space programs.

Space is the key question at the Geneva talks and that is not fortuitous. The point is that the launching of offensive weapons into space is not a project for the remote future but a terrible immediate danger. Claims about the "defensive" nature of these plans should not fool anyone. Sheltering beneath its "space shield," the United States intends to keep the whole world in fear and dictate its will to other peoples.

This is the nub of Washington's so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative," in whose implementation the Americans are seeking to involve their NATO allies.

The Soviet Union firmly opposes the launching of nuclear or other weapons into outer space and its transformation into an arena for "star wars" which would above all turn the whole earth to ashes. We consider that the militarization of space is not at all a "defensive operation." It would signify the beginning of a new and extremely dangerous round in the arms race by intensifying confrontation and the threat of worldwide catastrophe.

The direction the matter takes will depend on the American stance and also on those West European countries which the U.S. secretary of defense has given 60 days to consider whether to take part in the American "star wars" plan preparations. Each country, naturally, has the right to act as it deems necessary and expedient. However, the West Europeans' involvement in U.S. plans to carry the arms race into space will provide neither the security they desire nor a durable and reliable peace.

After all, the blue sky, which has from time immemorial attracted mankind's dreams and gaze, previously contained no danger apart from the occasional meteorite. However, if the United States is intending to wage war against the inhabitants of our planet from space, the peaceful sky will become a most dangerous nuclear bridgehead.

It is instructive that the recent WPC session held in Moscow adopted a special appeal to the peoples of the world entitled "No to Star Wars!" This appeal states that "the militarization of space would mark the beginning of a new and extremely dangerous kind of arms race, the intensification of confrontation, and the threat of universal catastrophe...If the 'star wars' plans are not stopped now, tomorrow may be too late".

The present talks have a particular symbolic significance. After all, they are being held at a time when the peoples of the world are celebrating the 40th anniversary of the great victory over Hitler's Germany and militarist Japan. Thousands of towns and villages were destroyed and 50 million people died on the battlefield or in the resistance movement or were tortured to death in concentration camps. The present peace on our planet was won at a terrible cost, and that, after all, was a "conventional," not a nuclear, war.

Our country is perfectly aware that the talks in Geneva are not easy. However, we are far from thinking them hopeless. The Soviet Union is ready to play its part honestly and expects the United States to do the same.

CSO: 5200/1087



U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

GORBACHEV DISCUSSES TALKS WITH SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL GROUP

PM251126 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Mar 85 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Meeting Between M.S. Gorbachev and the Consultative Council of the Socialist International on Disarmament"]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met in the Kremlin 22 March with the Consultative Council of the Socialist International for Disarmament including:

Kalevi Sorsa, vice chairman of the Socialist International, chairman of the Consultative Council for Disarmament, Pentti Vaananen, secretary general of the Socialist International, Walter Hacker (Austria), secretary of the Consultative Council of the Socialist International for Disarmament, Robin Sims (Canada), deputy secretary general of the Socialist International, Jenny Little, secretary for international issues of the Labor Party of Great Britain, Andreas von Buelow, chairman of the Commission for Security Issues under the board of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, Heinrich Buchbinder, chairman of the Commission for Security Issues of the Social Democratic Party of Switzerland, Chisato Tatebayashi, member of the Central Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of Japan, Francois Gaudement, representative of the French Socialist Party, Antonio Garcia Pagan, representative of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party, member of the Foreign Policy Commission and Commission for Defense Issues of the Chamber of Deputies of the Spanish parliament, Satiko Taguchi, secretary of the International Bureau, member of the Foreign Policy Committee of the Party of Democratic Socialism of Japan, Lauri Kangas, secretary for international affairs of the Social Democratic Party of Finland, Allan Rosas, expert for disarmament affairs of the Social Democratic Party of Finland, Riitta Korhunen, editor of the newspaper SUOMEN SOSIAL DEMOKRAATTI.

Taking part in the meeting was Boris Ponomarev, alternate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Kalevi Sorsa has congratulated Mikhail Gorbachev on his election as general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Kalevi Sorsa has reported on the activities of the council in the interests of resolving the problems of limitation and discontinuation of the arms race. He said that after the meetings held in Moscow, the Consultative Council would visit Washington for talks with representatives of the U.S. administration. The parties belonging to the Socialist International are concerned over the situation in the world, especially the

incessant arms build-up. The Consultative Council of the Socialist International opposes, in particular, the militarization of outer space.

The hope was expressed that the Soviet Union jointly with the United States would make every possible effort to restrict the arms race and, moreover, to end it altogether, Kalevi Sorsa said that the socialist and social-democratic parties participating in the Socialist International would contribute to that goal. He noted that the problem of restricting the arms race concerned not only the USSR and the United States but all of mankind and added that small countries and neutral and nonaligned states were called upon too and could make a contribution to that cause. The wish was expressed that the participants in the ongoing Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva would do everything possible to check the slip towards nuclear catastrophe. The year 1985, Kalevi Sorsa stressed, is a crucial year in which every possible measure should be taken to curb the arms race. In conclusion, Kalevi Sorsa expressed gratitude to the CPSU leadership for the welcome extended to the Consultative Council in Moscow and for the fruitful talks which had taken place.

Mikhail Gorbachev stressed that the foreign policy line of the CPSU and the Soviet state remained unchanged, as the March 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum had confirmed. The Soviet Union will follow unflaggingly the course of peace and progress.

It was noted in the course of the meeting that a very alarming situation had emerged in the world. The threat of nuclear war keeps growing. The arms race, unless curbed today, may evolve into a qualitatively new phase during which uncontrollable processes will begin. The situation is further compounded by deliberate actions aimed at subverting international trust and at aggravating confrontation in every direction. Threats of armed force and open intervention in the affairs of independent states are used merely because realities of the present-day world are disliked by certain forces.

The peace-loving public of the entire world call for an end to the dangerous arms race and removal of the war menace. Great hopes are pinned in this connection on the just-started Soviet-American talks in Geneva.

It is of principled importance that working out effective accords directed at preventing an arms race in outer space and ending it on earth, at limiting and reducing nuclear armaments, and at strengthening strategic stability will be the objective of the talks, as recorded in the joint Soviet-American statement. Ultimately, in the opinion of the sides, the talks should result in the elimination of all nuclear weapons everywhere.

The progress and productivity at the Geneva talks, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed, depend first of all on whether both sides will unswervingly abide by the reached agreement on the subject and objectives of the talks in all its parts. The Soviet Union, for its part, will be doing everything in its power to fulfill this agreement. We shall judge the intentions of the American side by its practical actions. It is essential that each side show goodwill and readiness for sensible compromises and, the most important thing, that the principles of equality and identical security be strictly observed.

We are resolutely against the talks becoming a kind of cover for the continued escalation of the arms race. This is why the Soviet Union proposes a freeze on the sides of nuclear arsenals, and end to the further deployment of the missiles. In particular, we are convinced that the termination of new American missile deployments in Europe with a simultaneous end to the buildup of Soviet counter-measures would be most helpful in solving the entire complex of questions under discussion in Geneva.

Efforts of most diverse public and political forces of the present epoch are directed at preventing nuclear war. This is the aim of large-scale peace initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community. These initiatives are in consonance with the UN decisions that reflect the views of the world community of nations. The public and leaders of many countries in no uncertain terms have come out in favor of returning to the policy of detente, terminating the arms race, and developing political dialogue and cooperation among states. The anti-war movement which has now become a major sociopolitical force in many a country emphatically advocates that. The awareness is spreading that in a nuclear age security of states cannot be based on force or threat of force. It is possible only as security for all. All this adds to the conviction that, given due effort, it is possible to bring about a change in the situation, to improve the international climate.

We know of the activities of the Consultative Council of the Socialist International in the field of disarmament and appreciate its striving to contribute to construction dialogue, Mikhail Gorbachev said.

The parties of the Socialist International, in view of their political leverage and influence, can facilitate in many ways the improvement of the international situation and the ending of the arms race and increase their contribution to the saving of mankind from nuclear catastrophe. The international situation demands energetic and effective efforts of the workers and democratic movement in the struggle against the threat of war. The CPSU for its part is prepared to cooperate vigorously with all the peace-loving public forces, including the parties participating in the Socialist International. This is our firm and invariable course and we will continue to pursue it consistently.

The conversation passed in a friendly and constructive spirit.

CSO: 5200/1080



U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

GORBACHEV THREATENS TO BREAK OFF TALKS IF 'ARMS RACE' CONTINUES

PM241357 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Apr 85 First Edition pp 1, 2

[Report on the convening and tasks of the 27th CPSU Congress delivered by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee M. S. Gorbachev at a plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee on 23 April]

[Excerpts]

It is proposed to place the following issues on the agenda of the congress:

1. Report by the CPSU Central Committee on the party's tasks;
2. Report by the CPSU Central Auditing Commission;
3. On the new edition of the CPSU program;
4. On changes in the CPSU rules;
5. On the basic guidelines for the economic and social development of the USSR for the 1986-1990 period and for the period up to the year 2000;
6. Elections to the party's central organs.

It is planned to hear and discuss appropriate reports on the reports of the CPSU Central Committee and Central Auditing Commission, and also on the question of the basic guidelines for economic and social development. As for the new edition of the program and the changes in the CPSU rules, their essence can be discovered in the report by the Central Committee, and individual reports can be dispensed with.

It is proposed to elect one delegate to the congress for each 3,670 Communists, that is, a total of 5,000 people. This will make it possible to represent well all our party's organizations and to reflect its social and national composition.

In the 10 months remaining before the congress, a comprehensive analysis and realistic assessment must be made of the results of all that has been done since the 26th congress; the prospects for further development and domestic and foreign policy tasks must be determined. Very important documents must be prepared, above all such fundamental

ones as a new edition of the CPSU program and the main directions of development during the next 5-year plan and to the end of this century, and they must be examined at the CPSU Central Committee plenum and then be widely discussed in the party and the country. A great deal of attention will have to be devoted to carrying out reports and elections in party organizations at a high level, and to completing the 11th 5-Year Plan in a worthy manner.

In short, it will be a period of strenuous and multifaceted work -- political, economic, organizational, and ideological-theoretical. Today we again confirm the continuity of the strategic policy elaborated by the 26th party congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums. In the Leninist understanding, continuity means unwavering forward movements, revealing and solving new problems, and eliminating everything that hinders development. We must rigorously follow this Leninist tradition, enriching and developing our party policy and our overall course toward perfecting the society of developed socialism.

The forthcoming 27th CPSU Congress will indisputably be a milestone in the country's development. Its significance is due to the paramount importance of the issues submitted for discussion, the nature of the present period, and the newness and scale of the tasks facing society. This adds a special tone to all of the party's pregress work and demands profound understanding of the existing situation, bold decisions, and vigorous activity.

The country has achieved great successes in all fields of social life. On the basis of the advantages of a new structure, it has ascended to the summits of economic and social progress in a short historical period.

Comrades, we are on the threshold of the 40th anniversary of the great victory over fascism. Recalling the inconceivably gigantic price paid for the victory by the Soviet people and the other peoples of the anti-Hitler coalition, again and again returning to the tragedy that befell mankind, the Communist Party and the Soviet Government see the main meaning of their foreign policy activity in not permitting a repetition of anything similar, and, all the more so, in not permitting a nuclear catastrophe. The Soviet Union and our party have been and will remain unswervingly true to the sacred memory of the immortal deed of the peoples who overcame fascism. The Soviet Union declares again and again that it will firmly follow the Leninist course of peace and peaceful coexistence that is determined by our social system, our morality, and world view.

We stand for regular, correct -- if you like -- civilized relations between states, based on genuine respect for the norms of international law. However, it must be absolutely clear that only if imperialism renounces attempts to resolve the historic argument between two social systems by military means can international relations be successfully directed into a channel of normal cooperation.

The cohesive community of socialist states, its economic and defense might, and its unity of action in the international arena, are an insuperable force in the struggle for the peaceful future of mankind. The achievement of military-strategic balance with the states of the aggressive NATO bloc is an exceptionally important historic gain for the fraternal countries of socialism. This parity must be cherished by all possible means, for the sake of peace. It reliably deters the aggressive appetites of imperialism. Nor shall we in future spare any effort to ensure that the USSR Armed Forces have all that is required to reliably defend our fatherland and its allies, so that nobody will be able to catch us unawares.

Mankind today has at its disposal a vast potential for peace, multifaceted experience, and sufficient historical and social perspective to understand where a policy of aggression can lead. This understanding unites peace-loving forces ever more closely; it activates antiwar and antinuclear movements, and raises more and more progressive, democratic detachments for the struggle against the threat of war.

Nobody should be surprised that Washington's egoistic militaristic course is arousing ever more criticism and resistance in many countries. A huge contribution to the common cause of the struggle for peace is being made by communist and workers' parties, trade, unions, and other mass public organizations.

There is no single people that desires war. This is a source of huge reserves and potential for carrying out the policy of peace and progress. Everything should be done in order that forces of militarism and aggression do not gain the upper hand in international relations. We are convinced: It is possible to prevent global war. However, as experience shows, the struggle for preserving peace and securing comprehensive security is not an easy task, it demands more and more effort. Through the imperialists' fault the international situation continues to be alarming and dangerous. Mankind has found itself with a choice: either the further fanning of tension and confrontation, or a constructive search for the mutually acceptable accords that would halt the process of material preparation for a nuclear conflict. The responsibility for the existing situation lies, first of all, with the ruling circles of the United States, and this should be stated in all clearness. They continue to be the initiators [zastrelshchiki] of the arms race, and they sabotage disarmament, a fact of which the world community is well aware. On their initiative, more and more types of mass annihilation weapons are created. Now they are trying to extend the arms race to space. Hundreds of U.S. military bases scattered all over the world also destabilize the situation in the world. The United States openly claims the "right" to interfere everywhere; it ignores, and often directly tramples underfoot, the interests of other countries and peoples, traditions of international relations, and existing treaties and agreements. It constantly creates hotbeds of conflicts and military danger, heating up the situation in various parts of the world. Today the United States is threatening the heroic people of Nicaragua, with military reprisal trying to deny them freedom and sovereignty, as was the case on Grenada. Solidarity with forces of progress and democracy, with the countries and peoples fighting for their freedom and independence and against the onslaught of reaction, is a matter of principle for us. Here our line is as clear as it always was.

One does not need special political vision in order to see how imperialism has intensified its subversive work and coordinated its activities against socialist states in the course of the last few years. This applies to all areas: political, economic, ideological, and military.

We invariably advocate the development of normal, equal relations with capitalist countries. Vexing problems and conflict situation should be solved by political means -- such is our firm conviction. The Politburo bases itself on the fact that the interstate documents of the period of detente, including the Helsinki Final Act, have not lost their significance.

They are an example of how international relations can be built if one is guided by principles of equality and identical security, by the realities that have arisen in the world, if one does not strive for any advantage, but looks for mutually acceptable solutions and accords. It would appear that in connection with the 10th anniversary of the European Security and Cooperation Conference it would be useful if, on behalf of the states that signed the Final Act, the will were expressed once again in Helsinki to overcome the dangerous tension, to develop peaceful cooperation and constructive principles in international life.

Our readiness to improve relations with the United States is also known, for mutual benefit and without attempts to encroach upon the legitimate rights and interests of each other. There is no sort of fatal inevitability of confrontation between the two countries. If one is to interpret both the positive and negative experience accumulated by the history of Soviet-U.S. relations -- both remote and recent history -- it should be said that the most rational thing is to look for ways to smooth out relations, to build a bridge of cooperation, but to build it from both sides.

However, the already concluded first stage of the Geneva negotiations provides grounds for saying that Washington is not holding a course directed at accord with the Soviet Union. This is evident if only from the fact that it is altogether refusing to discuss the question of preventing the arms race from spreading into space at the same time as discussing the question of limiting and reducing nuclear weapons. In this way it is violating the accord reached in January on the interlinking of the three directions: preventing the arms race in space; reducing nuclear strategic weapons; and reducing medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. A question arises: how to explain such a position? It is explained by the fact that certain U.S. circles still want to achieve a dominant position in the world, primarily in the military sphere. We have more than once drawn the attention of the U.S. side to the fact that these arrogant plans have no future. The Soviet Union and its friends and allies, indeed all other states that take a stance for peace and peaceful cooperation, do not recognize the right of any state or group of states to supremacy and or to impose their will on other countries and peoples.

The Soviet Union, for its part, has never posed itself such tasks, and will not. We would like to express the hope that the present U.S. attitude will be amended. This would open the possibility for achieving mutually acceptable accords. For our part, such readiness is evident. Evidence of this is the USSR proposal that both sides should introduce for the entire period of the talks a moratorium on creating space weaponry, and a freeze on strategic nuclear arsenals. Continuing this line, the Soviet Union unilaterally announced a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles and on the buildup of other countermeasures in Europe. All over the world this decision was assessed as important and constructive, and likely to promote the success of the talks.

I should like to remind you that this is not the only step of its kind. Since 1982 the unilateral commitment of the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons has been in operation, and since 1983 the unilateral moratorium on being first to put anti-satellite weapons into space has been in effect. Not to one of these initiatives has the U.S. Government responded with a single gesture of goodwill. On the contrary, it has been doing everything to present the actions of the USSR, which are directed at a reduction of the war dangers and at reaching understandings, in a false light, and to provoke mistrust in them. In a word, everything is being done just to avoid positive steps in response.

One cannot help being surprised, too, at the haste with which the U.S. Administration replies with its standard and customary "no" to our proposals, which is obvious evidence of the United States' unwillingness to steer the matter toward reasonable results. I will say one thing: An arms race and talks on disarmament cannot be combined. That is clear, if one is not to fall into hypocrisy and aim to deceive public opinion. The Soviet Union will not facilitate such a course, and this should be known by all those who are now engaged in a political game and not in serious policy. We would not want a repetition of the sorry experience of the previous talks. For its part, the Soviet Union will persistently work in Geneva for concrete, mutually acceptable agreements that would make it possible not only to end the arms race but also advance the cause of disarmament. Now as never before, political will is needed for the sake of peace on earth, for the sake of a better tomorrow.

CSO: 5200/1107



U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

WEEKLY DISCUSSION SHOWS VIEW PROGRESS OF TALKS

'International Situation' 29 March

LD310816 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1715 GMT 29 Mar 85

["International Situation--Question and Answers" program presented by Vyacheslav Lavrentyev, foreign affairs commentator, with Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, political observer; Vladimir Tsvetsov, political observer; Yuriy Vybornov, correspondent in Rome; and Aleksandr Popov, correspondent in Beirut]

[Excerpts] [Shishlin] Regarding the work done during the last 2 and 1/2 weeks at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, these talks, as you know, are being conducted in an atmosphere of confidentiality. This seems justifiable, for the purpose of creating a maximum of favorable opportunities and avoiding external influences on the course of these talks.

[Lavrentyev] Nevertheless, judging from statements made by the U.S. Administration in connection with the talks, it is Washington's view that the U.S. delegation's position in Geneva should be supported with the pressure of force, by escalating the arms race. This was, in particular, the administration's argument in demanding new allocations for building strategic MX missiles. These allocations were approved by Congress. The star wars program pursues the same purpose, and \$26 billion has already been allocated for its development. This manner of action -- as noted by the press abroad too -- cannot but cause concern, since talks can be held only on the basis of equality and equal security.

Nikolay Vladimirovich, in the press lately there have been some rather contradictory statements by a number of state and political figures from the West regarding the U.S. star wars plans. What is, in reality, the attitude of America's NATO allies in Europe toward these plans? This question is put by Viktor Mikhaylovich Patukov from Rzhnev.

[Shishlin] There are numerous shades in the positions of various West European states. On the one hand, the immediate appearance may be that the NATO countries are maintaining a united front regarding support for the strategic directions of U.S. foreign policy. However, even within the framework of this common front, we often hear also the voice of concern, since West Europeans must of course be concerned about what would happen if the U.S. Administration's plans regarding the militarization of space enter into the practical stage. So, of course, West Europeans are beginning to realize that this would lead to a disturbance of the military-strategic parity, to disturbing the present relative stability in international relations.

In this connection, it seems to me that we should go back and recall the conversations held in Moscow in March between West European politicians and Soviet leaders. These conversations were sufficiently unequivocal that naturally the political circles, as well as the public, in West Europe feel quite legitimate concern about where the U.S. space militarization line will ultimately lead. It is no accident when verbal skirmishes constantly occur now between West European politicians and U.S. statesmen. Not long ago, for instance, one such argument arose between Howe, British foreign secretary, and Perle, U.S. assistant secretary for defense. Howe permitted himself the impermissible -- from the viewpoint of U.S. political circles -- namely, he dared criticize those same notorious star wars plans. What was said about Britain's doubts regarding the consequences of implementing the Strategic Defense Initiative expresses, it seems to me, not only Britain's concern. In particular, Dumas, French minister of foreign relations, said even more specifically, that the very idea of militarizing space in itself is extremely dangerous.

So let me say this again, the united front of the West European states regarding the plans of the present U.S. Administration just does not exist. However, apart from noting this, I would like to say also something about the tendency in the disposition of West European politicians. It seems to me that the closer they look into the U.S. space militarization plans, the more they feel concerned about their own fate, about the future of mankind. I think that this tendency in itself does not arise from mythical fears, but from a quite specific assessment of the real consequences of this unrestrained arms race, and of the new direction in this arms race. It seems to me, therefore, that the intensification of the political dialogue taking place between the European socialist and capitalist states, the resumption of contacts between the socialist and capitalist countries in Europe, promises to be sufficiently fruitful. This is so because the Europeans have a common home, the Europeans have a common concern to make this home safe, and the Europeans also have a common interest in making the world as a whole safe too.

[Lavrentyev] Viktor Volodko from Nakhodka asks us in a letter to give more details about the American Pershing II missile. He asks why it is considered a first-strike missile, and why it is called that.

Quite a lot is known about the Pershing II. The missile has a nuclear warhead, a guidance system and two solid-fuel engines. It has a flight range, according to various sources, from 1,800 to 2,500 km. Its launch weight is 7,200 kg, 10 meters long, and 1 meter wide. The flight time of these missiles from West Europe where they are stationed to the Soviet Union is just 5-6 minutes, so that the Pershing II is a typical first-strike weapon.

Now about the name of the missile. One more product of the U.S. military-industrial complex, it was given the name of the U.S. General John Pershing, a murky character, it has to be said. The path of the long military career of this man was literally lined with corpses. In command of a punitive corps in 1886, he slaughtered American Indian tribes, driving what was left of them onto reservations. In 1898, Pershing fought to suppress the revolutionary forces in Cuba that were fighting at that time against Spanish dominion, and at the same time, concealing his true aims under the banner of fighting European colonialists, he seized Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines. In 1914 American forces under the command of Pershing invaded Mexico. The general completed his campaigns during World War I in the post of commander in chief of U.S. forces in Europe.

In the history of the assertion of capitalism in America, Pershing is a figure of note. So it was not for nothing that those who create U.S. policy today, declaring a crusade against communism, gave his name to a weapon with which they hope to realize their expansionist plans.

'Studio 9' 30 March

OW301225 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0457 GMT 30 Mar 85

["Studio 9" program with Academician Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, director of the United States and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Yevgeniy Yevgenyevich Grigoryev, deputy chief editor of PRAVDA; moderated by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet television and radio]

[Excerpts] [Arbatov] In the world today, much is being said about the dynamism of Soviet policy. We also see the activities of other forces defending peace. I refer to the six-state declaration adopted in Delhi in January, and that was actually in winter; then there is the activity of the Socialist International in the field precisely linked with disarmament and ensuring peace. I think that the start of the very important Soviet-U.S. talks on the entire complex issues connected with nuclear and space weapons which began recently in Geneva is the result in some measure of these moods and anxieties.

[Grigoryev] If we look at the Western and, generally, world press, we see very many daily headlines, editorials, and commentaries which say that new possibilities, some new factors for progress, have emerged for breaking the ice that has accumulated during the last few years in world politics. So I think that can be no doubt that the general mood or the prevailing mood of at least the international community is for ending confrontation, for finding a way out of the present dead end, and for returning to the methods and ways of detente of the 1970's. In this connection, I would like to refer to a witness who should be quoted, such as Richard Perle, U.S. assistant defense secretary. The man is known for his militaristic views. Speaking in London recently, he said, apparently taking note of the mood existing in the world, literally the following: It is simply astonishing that nostalgia for arms control of the early 1970's has almost become an automatic reaction to alarm now being raised over the winding spiral of the arms race.

It seems to me that these moods prevailing now in international life are now quite seriously worrying the U.S. Administration because during the past week, or the last 10 days, the President, the chief of the administration, has gone back to statements and propaganda of the "empire of evil" type. He started with Canada, and recently, in his 23 March radio address to his fellow countrymen, he literally said that the Soviet Union is still aggressive, expansionist, and dangerous. Apparently, with this old propaganda which we know well from the past 4 years, they want to beat down and reduce the expectations of the people and to try to undermine the very high prestige of our foreign policy. But whether it will succeed is another matter.

[Zorin] Well, we also cannot ignore the fact that all these statements that you have just mentioned, Yevgeniy Yevgenyevich, are being made at the very time when the Geneva talks are beginning, rather have begun. Of course, it is still premature to judge the progress of these talks, but nevertheless, I would like to ask you a question, Georgiy Arkadyevich, at this stage of the talks. What concerns you most of all in these talks and what most reassures you? This is a two-part question. Let us start with what concerns you.



[Arbatov] Now, without intruding into the sphere that belongs to the conferees and talking rather about what is happening around the talks, I would say that what is of greatest concern is the lack of clarity, the vagueness regarding the intentions of the U.S. Government. What does it want from these talks? The rhetoric, already mentioned here, influences to a great extent the political atmosphere on the very eve of the talks.

This seems strange. If you want to hold talks, you should try to create an atmosphere in which the talks, which are already complex, can proceed as smoothly as possible. The opposite is being done, and generally an interesting thing is happening. If we look back, talks were always either preceded or accompanied by some kind of normalization of the political atmosphere. Now, I think, for some reason this is intentionally not being done. This, of course, raises a question.

Other things also raise questions. Why, for instance, after agreement was reached between Comrade Gromyko and Secretary of State Shultz on starting the talks—the agreement reached at the beginning of January—did the United States publish a report, again on the eve of the talks, in which the Soviet Union is accused, on the basis of false fabrications, of violating arms limitation agreements signed previously?

How should we interpret this? One may ask, when on the eve of the talks your future partner in the talks is suddenly declared an untrustworthy party, a cheating party, and so forth? Who, then, do the Americans want to talk to? Unfortunately, this is not the only thing. It is most alarming that the very fact of the talks is being used to actively suppress opposition to an arms build-up, to increase arms allocations, and to adopt new military programs. We saw this with the new MX missiles, voting on them was held last week...[Grigoryev interrupts]

[Grigoryev] In other words, I would like to say that at times, large and major problems of international politics are made dependent on some internal political decisions.

[Arbatov] Yes, they are made dependent on internal political decisions, but I am concerned about another thing. How are we to understand the real policy? After all, it is not being done simply to indulge someone, but this is a whole system of reasoning, that since we are holding talks we must build up our arms.

Now possibly, someone believes in this, although the entire postwar history of the arms race refutes such conclusions. Of course, we will not respond to the MX missile with concessions to the Americans at the talks, but in an effort to maintain a balance, we will apparently be forced to develop and install a new missile system. They have already seen this repeatedly, but nevertheless, they continue. So again, the question arises, what are they trying to achieve?

[Zorin] Besides, Georgiy Arkadyevich, take into consideration a fact that has already been discussed in our press. Pressure on congressmen in connection with the MX missile is being applied by an official who has been instructed to achieve the very opposite in Geneva, a reduction of arms.

[Arbatov] Yes. Well, you see, prior to the vote when Kampelman arrived to help work on the congressmen, one of the congressmen, (Sayskin), said that generally, Geneva had changed the balance. Now, this sounds simply incredible. The beginning of the talks changed the balance between the supporters and opponents of a new dangerous weapons system.

[Zorin] To the advantage of the opponents.

[Arbatov] Of course. The vote was carried with a small majority, and the House of Representatives also... [Grigoryev interrupts]

[Grigoryev] Yes, the U.S. press-- [Arbatov continues]

[Arbatov] ... also allocated 1.5 billion [as heard] for this matter.

[Grigoryev] The U.S. press in fact wrote that many congressmen are simply afraid to oppose the MX for fear they might be included among opponents of the Geneva talks.

[Arbatov] Of course, and this entire demagoguery is being put into play. But finally, what I would like to mention is simply that in violation of the agreement achieved in January during the meeting between Comrade Gromyko and Secretary of State Shultz, U.S. officials are insisting, almost demonstratively, that everything notwithstanding, they will continue with this space-based antimissile system which is commonly called star wars and that this is not subject to discussion. Now, how should we interpret all these question? How should the administration's intentions be understood if this period directly preceding the talks and during the beginning of the talks is overshadowed by these actions? Now, how this should be understood was a question asked by members of the Soviet parliamentary delegation that recently visited the United States, and among them, I asked U.S. congressmen about this.

Now, an answer here is difficult, and I think they themselves -- many of them at least -- are very concerned about this. Undoubtedly, a discussion is also beginning now in the United States on how to proceed, on how to build some kind of bridge between the aim being tabled at the talks and the aim being pursued by U.S. policy.

[Zorin] Well, you speak about discussions. The voting on MX missiles held very recently in the House of Representatives has revealed that there is serious opposition to the policy of increasing the arms race. First, there was a very small difference in the number of votes; and then, it is known that the White House has made maximum efforts, and the President himself....

[Arbatov interrupts] Of course that is a victory which will not come cheap for the administration ....

[Zorin interrupts] Yes.

[Arbatov] Every time, credit is used so heavily. It will be needed many more times during the many ballots to come, and all the more so as the United States is heading for intermediate elections, and the struggle will become more intense and all this will complicate the situation....

[Zorin interrupts] I have referred to this in order to show that there is actually a discussion going on in the United States. Yet, when you follow the world press, you get the impression that discussion in the United States is acute; but the discussion in Europe is even more acute. Yevgeniy Yevgenyevich, I would like you to speak on the subject.

[Grigoryev] The picture in Europe is, of course, not lacking some color. At any rate, there are many hues. If you take the active part of the community, the peace movement, those millions of people who take an active part in the struggle against the missiles, for detente in Europe -- these people have of course understood the dangerous character of President Reagan's SDI and resolutely oppose it.

At the beginning of March, I was a member of our delegation to the International Forum for Peace and Cooperation in Europe that was held in Belgium.

It was very representative, and represented fully a cross section of public opinion in Europe. It must be said that those there came out almost unanimously against the star wars program. It is a different matter for some people in Western Europe who could not escape being worked over by some of the press and other mass information media, a working over which the United States has been practicing for a long time.

The United States -- primarily the State Department and the Pentagon -- invites many journalists from West European countries, who then come out in support of SDI or the star wars program. Many politicians are also invited. Recently, the United States was visited by Lothar Spaeth, prime minister of the West German Land of Baden-Wuerttemberg.

Since his return from the visit, he acts in his country in the role of a very active propagandist of FRG participation in this program. He even has a kind of philosophic concept. He says, for instance, that the family tree of science is a unified system, and that its ramifications include branches of present-day military equipment and technology and of modern medical equipment. Whether we like it or not, that is a fact; and because of that we have to -- at any cost, says Spaeth -- take part in the U.S. program. He ...

[Arbatov interrupts] May I interrupt you. I think that here you have touched on a very interesting question: It deals with the insidiousness of the argument. Why does Spaeth have such moods? And, apparently many others in Europe have them too. The point is that Western Europe has really started to lag behind the United States and Japan in the scientific and technical field, and that this is of decisive significance for its prospects and future. Now the bait has been thrown: Take part with us Americans in research connected with star wars, and we shall then share scientific, technical and technological attainments with you. In fact, that is an inconsistent argument; because even if you take Spaeth's argument that on one side you have branches coming from the tree of science of a military character and on the other side of a peaceful character -- medical -- there arises the question, Why work at half strength, using half of the effort for useless and even very harmful and dangerous things? Is it not better to grow the tree of science so that it produces only peaceful branches and useful fruits...

[Grigoryev interrupts] Unfortunately, this is not the way they pose the question. They pose the question ...

[Arbatov interrupts] The Americans... but, in Europe many think that it is part of detente...

[Grigoryev interrupts] In Europe, yes. In this case, those who come out for participation or coparticipation in this U.S. program advance as argument the interests of their access to most modern and future technology. This has played its role on the eve of the Geneva talks when many West European countries -- NATO allies: Italy, Britain, and the FRG -- first of all supported, at least in words, the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative. Now, after the beginning of the Geneva talks, a certain evolution of views has been noted.

Now, the well-known statement made by British Foreign Secretary Howe raised quite a stir. He compared the Strategic Defense Initiative -- or President Reagan's star wars plan -- with a 21st century Maginot Line, pointing out its redundancy; because the Maginot line, a defensive line built in the 1930s along the Franco-German border, proved to be absolutely unnecessary in 1940 when the Hitlerites attacked France; they simply bypassed it.

Howe, in comparing the U.S. plan with this useless undertaking of the past, said that it is still not known where all this may lead and how it can improve the security of NATO countries. Besides, Howe declared fairly frankly that the star wars program, even at the research stage, will in practice lead to a destabilization of the existing strategic situation. Generally, this was almost a mutiny in NATO, a mutiny that was...

[Zorin interrupts] And this evoked, it seems to me, an outbreak of frenzy in Washington.

[Grigoryev] Yes, and this evoked not only an outbreak of frenzy, but also an outbreak of various kinds of statements in Washington. They attempted to express their bewilderment, but Prime Minister Thatcher, in one of her statements, by and large supported her foreign secretary's statement.

Furthermore, on 20 March, FRG Chancellor Kohl, at the congress of his party, the Christian Democratic Union, in Essen, also made a statement in his report, in which he said that the main thing at the Geneva talks -- that is, the first point among those that he listed as being the main ones -- should be the task of strengthening strategic stability and averting an arms race in space and on earth. Kohl's speech is being interpreted by the Western press and the West German press as a statement which distances him somewhat from his previous position and maintains a certain distance -- so to speak, increases the distance -- from this U.S. arms program.

A meeting between Mitterrand and Kohl was held, after which Mitterrand declared that the positions of both countries on this issue were fairly close. Now the French position is quite obvious and clear: It is a position categorically against plans for the militarization of space. What is going on here?

First of all, it seems to me that it is obvious that in West Europe they fear for the fate of the Geneva talks, and they are apprehensive that the categorical course of the United States may lead to the same sorry result as did its position at the Geneva talks on intermediate-range weapons 2 years ago. Second, West Europeans are apprehensive that if the star wars program is realized, then, as they put it, different zones of security will appear -- one security zone for the United States, another for its West European allies....

[Arbatov interrupts] More precisely, danger; the one for Europe, being much greater, whereas for the United States, maybe an illusory security that is extremely illusory. But, yes...



[Zorin interrupts] But the umbrella we have in mind is open over America, be it full of holes or not; but it is over America, while the Europeans suddenly find themselves without an umbrella.

[Grigoryev] Now, thirdly: Thirdly, it seems to me we can name another reason: that of France and Britain. If this concept of President Reagan's is realized, then of course the strategic concept on which the military policy of France and Britain are now being built will lose its necessary foundation. Now it seems to me to be also very important to mention, of course, the influence of the mood and the impact of west European public opinion, which cannot be disregarded in the West European capitals. So the discussion is continuing.

[Zorin] Yevgeniy Yevgenyevich, I would like to ask you to continue your answer to the question because, on the one hand discussions are continuing, whereas on the other hand, say, in Brussels, a decision has been adopted -- after prolonged wavering, but a decision suitable to Washington. A decision on deploying U.S. missiles on the territory of this country was adopted.

[Grigoryev] Yes, this was a typical case or a typical example of the U.S. practice of twisting its allies' arms. But many both within and outside of Belgium call this decision a Pyrrhic victory, so to speak, both for the Belgian Government and for NATO itself. The mood in Belgium is quite obvious. It was immediately demonstrated by an almost 200,000-strong demonstration in Brussels that was held after the Belgian Government's decision. Besides, parliamentary elections are to be held in Belgium this fall, and all opposition parties that presently almost have a balance with the ruling parties come out in practice for abrogation of the adopted decision and for a withdrawal, one can now say, of the missiles deployed in Belgium.

So, as they say, time will tell. The Belgians themselves, and not only the Belgians, believe that the struggle here is continuing.

[Zorin] Well, returning to Geneva talks, I would like to note that most political observers agree that the talks will be complicated, that they will go on for a long time, and that there is no need to rush the events. Georgiy Arkadyevich, what is your opinion about how long the talks will last? And what do you consider to be long?

[Arbatov] You see, this is precisely a very decisive question that deals with the core of the problem, because the talks are really difficult. You cannot expect an agreement tomorrow. Some say that they will last for years; I have encountered--moreover, from quite reliable sources--statements saying that 5 years will elapse before the first agreements are reached, and I fear that when the moment for such an agreement comes--according to U.S. opinion--and if the arms race continues throughout all these years, we shall enter--and I use an American expression--a nonagreement era. I mean a period when--due to the development of new weapons systems and because it will become practically impossible to verify agreements, and very difficult to calculate the balance because of new imbalances and to compare and work out ratios of defensive and offensive weapons--agreements will simply become more complicated than at present. In other words, the complications of the talks will overtake the level of agreements the sides could reach. This is precisely the reason for the importance



of the Soviet Union's proposal on freezing nuclear arsenals and the testing and deployment of space weapons in order to come to a stop. Then it will be possible to hold talks and not fear that we will enter an area of even more difficult problems before reaching a successful completion of the talks. And this proposal is being supported by very many people, both in the United States....

[Grigoryev interrupts] We are proposing the same for Europe....

[Arbatov interrupts] And in Europe, yes.

[Grigoryev] Stopping the deployment of missiles. This idea is being strongly supported by many people in Western countries. And I refer again to the forum I recently attended, it must be said that similar thoughts have been expressed by many participants in this representative session....

[Arbatov interrupts] Now Sorsa's statement actually contains an official expression of Comrade Gorbachev's proposal about stopping the further deployment of intermediate-range weapons in Europe and, of course, including the countermeasures that we are adopting on the development of these weapons.

[Zorin] We have focused on the first part of the question which I posed at the beginning. We have devoted much time to the problem of anxieties connected with the talks that have begun in Geneva.

I would like you, Georgiy Arkadyevich, to move on to the second part of the question which I have posed about the hopes connected with the talks that have begun. The world community hopes that the talks will produce some kind of results; and inasmuch as we are Marxists, let us begin with the economic aspect of the problem.

[Arbatov] Economics plays a great role here, too, because there is saying in the United States, "There is no free lunch." A policy that wastes tremendous resources for useless--from society's point of view--and also very dangerous things, primarily like the arms race, generally has to be paid for. We know that from history.

[Zorin] I would like to say that the present Washington leadership, having uncoiled an enormous spiral of the arms race has apparently made a very serious mistake with long-term consequences. The mistake lies in the fact that the resources of the American economy have been overestimated and the scale of the arms race has exceeded its resources.

It is difficult to tell what Washington is counting on when it uncoils the arms race not according to the means or resources of the U.S. economy. Either the boss of the White House is insufficiently aware of all the consequences or, like one of the French kings, he operates on the principle: I couldn't care if the flood followed us, and is not very concerned about the legacy he leaves for his successor. But the fact remains--an objective fact--the current level of military expenditure is a backbreaking burden for the U.S. economy. If appropriate modifications are not made, the future situation will be fraught with the most serious consequences. I do not know whether the officials of Washington are aware of this, but if someone believes that we in Moscow do not see this and do

not follow this problem carefully, he is making a very serious mistake. We can see it.

[Arbatov] Yes, we are aware of this, after all the U.S. economy is the most powerful economy in the capitalist world and of course one cannot underestimate its resources, but these resources certainly have their limits. In general, not only the desire to achieve military superiority was behind gambling on the arms race, but another aim to impose the arms race on us in order to bleed us dry economically, undermine us economically, was behind the arms race. I cannot say that it is very easy for us. Of course our country has to, in looking after its security, spend more than it would like to on these needs in conditions of the exacerbation of the situation and an increase in the arms race. But on the path to achieving their aims--and one can see this today--the Americans themselves will not survive, so to speak, I mean economically. You see, this question of the deficit has today already become the main question of political struggle in the United States. I think that it will be the primary question in the whole political campaign associated with the congressional elections, when the current administration--if these problems grow--could also lose the Senate. Their political rivals already have the House.

[Grigoryev interrupts] However, the elections are a long way off, so that [word indistinct] in Washington will be able to do something.

[Arbatov interrupts] But you see the campaign will begin soon. Generally, one should not count on the arms race stopping automatically. You see, the war in Vietnam, the change in attitude toward it, was to a significant extent connected with what? First, a mass public movement; and second, an understanding by the U.S. ruling circles that the war was doing great economic harm to the United States and its interests. Now the same mood is beginning regarding the entire political course, including the arms race. Of course, it is presently difficult to predict how far it will go and how far it will progress. Unfortunately, here we must... [changes thought] I would like to quote a statement by Academician Aleksandrov, president of our Academy of Sciences, who has made many such colorful statements: That those who build prisons are very rarely incarcerated in them. And in this case it applies to this administration. Not it, but its successors--the following U.S. administrations--and the next generations of Americans will have to pay the money, but today this already gives rise to serious concern.

[Grigoryev] Well, American problems are of course great, and they probably to some extent disturb the American public. However, the world cannot dance to America's tune and wait for what circumstances there will be for the holding of this or that election. Indeed.

[Zorin] These are not only, and perhaps even not so much economic, but primarily political factors.

[Arbatov] Yes, these are political factors. You see this supplements something else. In recent years, other changes have occurred, which also create prerequisites for intensifying the political struggle against the policy of military preparations and the arms race policy. The catastrophic consequences of nuclear war have become much clearer.

The physicians' movement has played a major role, which has shown that the only method of treating an illness like nuclear war is prevention, that no other methods are effective, and that no one can expect to be saved. Then there are the conclusions of scientists regarding a nuclear winter, which incidentally have sharply increased the involvement of all countries. Recently, New Zealand Prime Minister Lange made an address and frankly said that before, we in New Zealand thought that we could sit with arms folded and wait for everyone in the northern hemisphere to destroy each other. Now we can see that this fate would bypass no one if there were a nuclear war.

In this connection, I would like to quote the Delhi Declaration, which I have mentioned, by the heads of six states India, Argentina, Mexico, Sweden, Tanzania and Greece. All this is very emotionally expressed. I now quote: All countries, and even all individuals have lost the right to vote on questions of their life and death. A small group of people and machines in distant cities can decide our destiny every day. And every day of life becomes a blessing, as if all mankind--the declaration states--is a prisoner in a death chamber awaiting execution every day, and like all innocent prisoners, we refuse to believe that this execution will ever take place.

[Grigoryev] You see, emotions are also a political factor, a political factor in the struggle for peace.

[Arbatov interrupts] A political factor. Certainly, certainly.

[Grigoryev interrupts] The rational and simple truths of our age that nuclear war cannot be permitted and it is time to cease the arms race, must reach the consciousness of the billions of people on our earth, and must become a guide for political actions of those who are responsible for the policies of their countries.

[Arbatov] Well, we have indeed recently seen that all these increases in problems and difficulties are connected with this. The basic hopes--I think one should not await other miracles--the basic hopes are that the political struggle against the threat of war and the arms race is developing and intensifying, and this is, strictly speaking, the main thing that can give hope today.

[Grigoryev] Georgiy Arkadyevich, but is this political involvement today enough, and is this political struggle so strong that we may be satisfied with it?

[Arbatov] Well you see, this depends on how you look at it. [Arbatov raises a glass of water] One can consider the glass half empty or half full. It depends on what trends one sees, either one is pouring into the glass or pouring out of the glass. I think of course, that this political struggle and involvement turned out to be insufficient to stop the arms race and return to the rational policy of strengthening peace, peaceful coexistence, detente, and the development of international cooperation. But, at the same time, we can see that it is becoming increasingly difficult to conduct the old policy and one has to maneuver much more, and the example of America and its allies shows this very graphically.

Moreover, on what else can one pin one's hopes? You know, with all due respect to those holding the talks in Geneva, we still have to say that their efforts are not sufficient to change policy itself and political realities. The efforts of both negotiators and diplomats can be effective only in conditions where the political struggle sufficiently creates serious changes in the international situation, in the international climate, the nature of the policies of many states, and so on.

So, this precisely is what one can count on and what instills certain hopes, and I think in this connection we have now indeed entered a very interesting period, when all these processes are developing more and will develop extremely dynamically.

'International Observers Roundtable' 31 March

LD311935 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 31 Mar 85

["International Observers Roundtable' With Gennadiy Ivanovich Gerasimov, editor in chief of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI; Nikolay Ivanovich Yefimov, first deputy editor in chief of IZVESTIYA; and Vitaliy Sergeyevich Sobolev, All-Union Radio commentator]

[Excerpt] [Sobolev] Of prime importance not only for us, but also for the destinies of the whole of mankind, is the united, active stance of the fraternal countries in defense of peace, in the struggle for the halting of the arms race and disarmament, above all nuclear disarmament, as well as the prevention of the militarization of space. As you well know, Soviet-American talks have started in Geneva thanks to the Soviet Union's initiative. It is no exaggeration to say that the whole world is now hoping for the success of these talks, and the Soviet Union has a sincere desire for a successful accord. At the same time, our country is resolutely against these talks serving as a screen for someone to camouflage a further arms race. It is very important that everything necessary for the success of the talks be implemented, and that the parties refrain from anything that does not favor the talks. As is well known, the Soviet Union is proposing a freeze on nuclear arsenals and a halt to the deployment of new missiles. Naturally, the talks will not be favored by the U.S. Congress' allocation of funds for an additional 21 MX missiles, by the continuation of the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe. Under pressure from Washington, Belgium has agreed to start deployment of cruise missiles on its territory, although, as opinion polls show, three-quarters of the population of Belgium are opposed to this decision.

The chief problem of disarmament at the moment is to avert the space arms race, and actions which go in the direction of that arms race naturally do not promote the achievement of an accord at Geneva.

[Gerasimov] Perhaps I ought to add something on the subject of these MX missiles. To a significant degree, this vote to allocate \$1.5 billion for a fresh batch of missiles--21 of them--is of a symbolic nature.



It is, of course, a serious addition to the U.S. nuclear arsenal, but it must be said that that arsenal is already very, very large.

[Sobolev] The figure has recently been reported as 26,000 warheads.

[Gerasimov] Here we have 21 missiles; each of them actually has 10 warheads, so that makes a total of 210 warheads. But Reagan and his administration made quite unprecedented efforts to push the \$1.5 billion for these missiles through both houses of U.S. Congress. Reagan then called it, quote, a vote for peace, unquote.

They explained it in the following way: They need these missiles in order to show American determination at the talks on disarmament. This is evidently some kind of reverse logic, because we say, let's freeze the nuclear arsenal, let's reduce it, and the United States says, yes, in principle, we are ready for that, but we will first build up these nuclear arsenals. Anyway, U.S. observer James Reston wrote in THE NEW YORK TIMES that Reagan hadn't persuaded the Congressmen of the efficiency of the MX missiles as a weapons system, he had just frightened them. Reston draws a further conclusion: We have a strategy of war, but we have no strategy of peace. American observers, who are at present writing quite a lot about these very missiles, have come to the conclusion that the U.S. Administration adheres to an old political theory, according to which it is much more important to inspire fear than trust. Really, we see here efforts taken from the notorious position of strength -- that is, an attempt to dictate at the talks, which naturally the Americans will never succeed in doing, because the talks should be held on an equal basis. This whole story with the MX to put it diplomatically raises questions about American sincerity at these talks. As regards the military and technological side of the issue, this story makes us alert because these are first-strike weapons; these missiles are vulnerable, according to American data; they can be only used as first-strike weapons. We can also add the missiles that are being deployed in Belgium, West Germany, and Britain; the United States would like to see them deployed in the Netherlands; they have already been deployed in Italy. These are also first-strike weapons.

[Sobolev] Now, you were talking about the doubts about sincerity of the American side, Gennadiy Ivanovich. In connection with that I would like to quote the American paper THE WASHINGTON POST, which once noted that of all the shows of insincerity now surrounding the discussion of the star wars problems, the most dishonest is perhaps the one which maintains that somehow the creation of a system in the spirit of star wars will put an end to the arms race. A report by the British OBSERVER that the United States of America is secretly preparing a weapon capable of penetrating the space anti-missile defense of a potential enemy completely justifies these words about dishonesty. It seems to be common knowledge that the arms race has always been a competition between, say, for a start, the sharpness of the sword and the firmness of chain mail, more than between armor and shells; emergencies of antiaircraft artillery forced no one to stop the production of aircraft, and the development of antitank guns has not halted production of tanks; they have merely become more complicated, heavier, and more expensive. The same, as we can see, is happening to the star wars program. The Americans themselves are making preparations to build both the armor they are talking about and the shells for these star wars. What is their assertion worth that space weapons guarantee salvation to the people, that they will lead to the elimination of offensive weapons? The main point is that the United States has undertaken this program with, quote, peaceful intentions, unquote; so dishonesty -- the word used by THE WASHINGTON POST -- is very appropriate, perhaps is not even strong enough.



[Gerasimov] But some Americans, roughly speaking, are buying it, in the sense that Americans want--well, who wouldn't wish it--want to be protected, want to feel somewhat more comfortable.

[Sobolev] But instead of protection they are offered a new spiral of the arms race.

[Gerasimov] Right, because in our nuclear age defense can be only along a track of disarmament and not along the track of some sort of technical defense, the way it could have been depicted in the years of World War II, say, in the pre-nuclear age. Let's take air defense, for instance: It was considered good and adequate if a certain percentage of bombers was downed; if a couple of bombers reached their targets, this was considered a good air defense. On the other hand, antimissile defense has to be completely effective, because one missile that breaks through is strong enough to destroy the entire target with its nuclear might. Nevertheless, Reagan trades in hope; he is attempting to inspire an absolutely false hope that it is possible, in one way or another, to find a technical solution to the whole problem and to survive under some sort of mythical shield.

[Yefimov] Last week might be called a week of intensified pressure on the U.S. allies and intensified U.S. attempts to delude them. Washington dreams about getting them to join its star wars plans, that is, join its course aimed at gaining military superiority over the Soviet Union. West European countries, displaying discipline within NATO, for a long period of time were reserved toward the U.S. plans to militarize space. They did not pronounce their attitude out loud; and if they did, it took such a highly veiled, diplomatic form that it could be understood in different ways. But the last 2 weeks show that that is now changing. Officials in Britain, the FRG, France, and a number of other countries have let it be known that they not only do not share the enthusiasm of the White House about the star wars of the future, but that they oppose them. For example, that was the way in which the Conservative British newspaper THE SUNDAY TELEGRAPH summed up a speech by Sir Geoffrey Howe, the British foreign secretary. Sir Geoffrey Howe, the newspaper wrote, rejected the plan put forward by the U.S. President for setting up nuclear defenses in space as being an expensive, unrealistic, and potentially dangerous fantasy. Dumas, the French minister of external relations, also rejected the allegedly defensive nature of the U.S. plans. The American plan, the minister said, leads to overarming. That is what the militarization of space would become, and consequently it would mean an increase in the risk and in the danger. This plan does not accord with the desire to ensure security.

[Gerasimov] There is a very curious twist, I would say, here as to why Britain and France in particular do not like the American antimissile defense plans: they understand that if an arms race starts in this field, and if--theoretically--let's say the Soviet Union creates similar antimissile defenses to those they intend to create in the United States, then the British and French nuclear forces, which are relatively weak, will turn out to be redundant. This is something that worries them very much.

[Yefimov] But this is not the only thing. Washington gave a hostile reception to its allies' statements. Richard Perle, assistant to the U.S. defense secretary on political issues, turned up immediately in London and accused Geoffrey Howe of depicting the American plans in a tendentious light. Another highly placed Washington official stated that what the Europeans were doing was simply whining. The U.S. President himself was forced to intervene and observe that Great Britain's foreign secretary was not the government of the country.

But the office of the British prime minister reacted immediately, saying that a speech of that kind, that is, the speech by Sir Geoffrey Howe, had without any doubt received the go-ahead from Margaret Thatcher herself. In short, the differences in approach to Washington's star wars have made themselves clear, and the crude attempts to snub the West Europeans have not yet brought any success.

[Gerasimov] But now, indeed, the United States is trying to involve them in scientific and research work in this field.

[Yefimov] There you are right, and they have changed the record. Weinberger, the U.S. defense secretary, sent a letter to all of his NATO colleagues, and also to the defense ministers of Japan, Australia and Israel, containing a request that joint involvement in research work into space militarization should be examined.

[Gerasimov] A timetable was given.

[Yefimov] In other words, they decided in Washington that the allies should be tempted by large profits, but they did not forget to stipulate that a mere 60 days were allowed for reflection by the allies. They had to say either yes or no within that period.

[Gerasimov] But West Germany has already said that it cannot give a yes or no answer within 60 days. Australia has already said no. The Danish parliament....

[Sobolev, interrupting] The FRG has demanded additional information.

[Yefimov] Nevertheless, it shows how uncereemoniously, crudely, and openly Washington is dragging its allies into a new twist of the arms race.

CSO: 5200/1069

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FURTHER COMMENTARIES ON CONTINUING PROGRESS OF TALKS

U.S., Soviet Approaches Contrasted

LD241655 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 24 Mar 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program with IZVESTIYA political observer Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin; All-Union Radio political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin; and All-Union Radio commentator Viktor Nikolayevich Levin]

[Excerpts] [Levin] The socialist countries view their success as a basis for further advancement and implementing the bold plans for the further development of industry and agriculture and raising the peoples' well-being. But, quite naturally, we need to secure peaceful conditions and guarantee peaceful, creative labor to implement those plans and put them into practice. We need peace.

[Bovin] Here, of course, both our attention and the attention of world public opinion are now riveted on what is happening in Geneva. It is obvious why. The overall world climate depends on what is decided, or what is not decided, there. Well, the situation there is--although, of course, there's not a particularly great deal you can say about Geneva, as you know, comrades, because they agreed there that the talks would be held in secret--that a real exchange of opinions has already started. In other words, the Americans are presenting their point of view, their position, and we are presenting ours. That is roughly what the situation is now. Of course, what is going on around the Geneva talks can be seen far more clearly and is far more evident, and certain conclusions can also be drawn from that standpoint.

[Shishlin] Here it has to be said that there are two circles around Geneva. One of these is the Soviet circle, and it is true to say that the Soviet position, both on the eve of the Geneva talks and when the talks started, is in fact aimed at searching for a reasonable compromise.

[Levin] The Soviet Union's position at the Geneva talks was set out very precisely by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev during his meeting with the Consultative Council on Disarmament of the Socialist International. He said that progress at the talks and the results they bring depend first and foremost on whether both sides adhere strictly to all the parts of the agreement reached on the subject and aims of the talks. For its part, the Soviet Union will do everything it can to put that agreement into practice. We will judge the

intentions of the U.S. side by the practical action that it takes. Each of the sides must show goodwill and a readiness for reasonable compromises, and, most importantly, there must be strict observation of the principles of equality and equal security. We are resolutely against the talks being turned into some sort of screen concealing a further buildup of the arms race. That is why the Soviet Union is proposing that the nuclear arsenals of the sides be frozen and that the further deployment of missiles be halted. In particular, we are convinced that halting the deployment of the new U.S. missiles in Europe, at the same time as an end to the stepping up of the Soviet countermeasures, will substantially promote the solution of the whole complex of questions under discussion in Geneva. This week, too, talks were held between Comrade Gromyko and Comrade Fischer, the GDR foreign minister. The coordination of foreign policy is the standard practice of socialist international relations; that course is pursued constantly and systematically, and those talks continue the overall line of cooperation among the socialist countries. The statement on the results of that visit notes, in particular, and I would especially like to draw our listeners' attention to this, that the GDR fully supports the position of the Soviet Union at the talks in Geneva with the United States on space and nuclear weapons. We are supported by all the countries of the socialist community.

[Shishlin] As for the U.S. circle around Geneva, here the picture looks somewhat different.

[Levin] Totally different.

[Shishlin] The United States is stubbornly clinging to the President's so-called Strategic Defense Initiative.

[Bovin] You know, comrades, that this is the official title, Strategic Defense Initiative, but literally 2 days after Reagan spoke, Senator Kennedy made a speech and called it a star wars program, and this name stuck, while the President became upset. He is terribly displeased with it being called star wars. One journalist, William Safire of THE NEW YORK TIMES, even announced a competition, saying that as the President does not like star wars, let's find another name. It seems that nobody was able to think up a better one.

[Shishlin] But one way or another the overall allocations for this star wars program, or the Strategic Defense Initiative, are considerable -- \$26 billion over 5 years. The propaganda apparatus in the United States has been switched on to publicize this very dangerous and costly venture. And -- this may be even more substantial -- the United States is making every effort to line up its allies. In particular, it is a matter of involving West Germany, Japan, and Britain, i.e. to make use of the intellectual and technological potential of those countries in order to put these ideas into practice. Well, strictly speaking, the idea is a simple one. In the final analysis it amounts to aiming at achieving a sort of strategic breakthrough in relation to the Soviet Union, and to supplying a solution to the tasks which had been posed for a number of years by the present U.S. Administration, namely to ensure military strategic superiority.

[Bovin] The thing is not only what they are intending to do in space, Nikolay Vladimirovich, but what they are already now doing on earth.

[Shishlin] Absolutely.

[Bovin] Because all these programs to modernize the U.S. strategic triad have not only not been set aside, but they are being fully implemented now. Take the unfolding of the MX battle they had this last week in Congress.

[Shishlin] Yes, Aleksander Yevgeniyevich, I think we must remind our listeners that we are talking about the intercontinental ballistics missiles with 10 warheads. Every warhead is 150 metric kilotons, and the power of this warhead is 20 times greater than the power of the warhead which was used to destroy the Japanese city of Hiroshima.

[Bovin] Yes, these are the most up-to-date missiles, very accurate. The Americans estimate that the range of probable deviation is only 90 meters i.e. they make a precise hit. The President is now demanding appropriations for 21 MX missiles, about \$1.5 billion. Following direct pressure on the Senate last week, the Senate confirmed this program of Reagan by 55 votes against 45, while the House of Representatives is so far short of resisting and will be voting next week. A few days ago Shultz wrote an article in THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, under the topical headline: "Arms Control and MX -- Both Are Needed." You see the irrationality of the American attitude? On the one hand to sit in Geneva and talk about disarmament, while on the other hand in fact to continue the arms buildup. And this is their sort of logic. I shall simply read you an extract from the article by the U.S. secretary of state. MX, says Shultz, is an essential element of the modernization of our aging strategic deterrent forces. It is not a trump card at the negotiations, he stresses. However, this question has a direct bearing on our chances of success in Geneva. The incentives pushing the Soviet Union to embark on effective measures to reduce nuclear weapons will be considerably reduced if we unilaterally halt the creation of a substantially important component of the modernization of U.S. strategic forces. There is also an upside-down logic here. Shultz understands that the U.S. congressmen, many of them, want success in Geneva.

He is trying to prove to them that the more actively we conduct this modernization policy, the more new missiles there are, the easier we shall find it to reach agreement with the Russians in Geneva, although on the contrary the reverse situation applies here. But nonetheless, the interests of politicking, I would say, invert common sense for the Americans and make them think in a manner far from logical; that's how I'd put it.

[Levin] Vice President Bush of the United States also spoke in the very same vein recently at the Council for International Relations in Baltimore. He also argued in favor of deploying MX missiles, and said that it will help the attainment of an agreement in Geneva. But this speech by Bush deserves attention in my view for another reason. In exhorting the congressmen to vote for MX, he spoke this sentence: If Congress votes against, it will lead to a senseless waste of billions of dollars already invested in the MX program. Incidentally, the strategic initiative....

[Shishlin interrupts] Thirteen billion dollars they have spent on MX, I think.

[Bovin] Already on MX.

[Levin] The same thing is happening with the strategic initiative. They speak out about scientific research work and are allocating 26 billion to it, and then they'll say, well, lads, we've spent so much, we can't just keep it to research, we must put the weapons into space.



[Shishlin] Well, it is typical all the same that these U.S. plans for the militarization of space are causing concern in progressive public circles. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries are resolutely against these plans. U.S. allies are also alarmed by these plans. Quite recently, Prime Minister Fabius of France gave an interview to the U.S. weekly TIME. This is what he says concerning this U.S. program: The implementation of the American initiative in the area of strategic defense will lead to the opening of new areas of the arms race, as a result of which the approximate balance of forces which has come about in the world may be violated. A perfectly clear statement.

[Levin] Incidentally, as the British press reports, a very sharp clash occurred a few days ago between British Foreign Secretary Howe, and Assistant U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Perle. Howe, in a very cautious way, expressed some misgivings in relation to this same American Strategic Defense Initiative. Officially, you know, the Thatcher government supports the United States.

[Bovin] They, like the other NATO members, support scientific research work. That is how they put it. But as for deploying or not deploying, say, this system, that will be only after talks with the Soviet Union. That is the position.

[Levin] But, at the same time, they are already expressing great doubts, great misgivings over the American concept. Although this was expressed very delicately, Perle made sharp attacks on Howe, and in general, I think that in so doing Perle achieved only the reverse effect: He gave wide publicity to the row and showed the British public that the United States does not want to allow any delicacy in this matter, but is fully determined to press ahead very sharply. Speaking of sharpness, by the way, our attention is drawn to the fact that when he was recently in Canada, on 18 March, Reagan issued such anti-Soviet statements as he has not permitted himself for a long time, and these sharp attacks against our country, against the background of Geneva, are of course food for thought.

[Shishlin] But I still want to come back to the theme of opposition to the American plans which, it seems to me, fully merit our attention, in particular in connection with the Moscow visit of the social democrats of the Socialist International group.

[Bovin] This is a special group created by the Socintern to work out questions of disarmament and arms control; it specializes in these problems.

[Levin] In speaking of the public's attitude on matters concerning problems of the arms race, one should also mention the occurrences which were played out in Belgium last week connected with the decision of the Belgian Government on the deployment of the first 16 of the total number of 49 American cruise missiles at Florennes base. You probably already know, comrades, the fairly scandalous, I would call it, history of this decision. The decision was made by the government at the time when the planes bringing the missiles had already left U.S. territory and were heading for Belgium. You know that the deployment itself started before parliament had confirmed the government's decision. This also is a very clear indication of how the United States twisted the arm of the Belgian Government and how the Government is ignoring the views of parliament and the population, especially if one considers that according to data from public opinion polls, 82 percent of Belgians are against the deployment of these missiles. But, in the final analysis, the parliament approved, by a majority of votes, the given decision of the government in which the Christian Democrats play first fiddle. It is

very important to note that wide sections of the West European public--and not only the democratic public--now consider that the success of the Belgian Christian Democrats in implementing their policy on missile deployment may cost them very dearly. For example, the British FINANCIAL TIMES newspaper writes that the debate on the issue of deploying U.S. cruise missiles in Belgium dealt a blow to the Christian Democrats. Ahead, at the end of this year, there are to be parliamentary elections, and there are very serious grounds for supposing that the decision foisted on the country by the government led by the Christian Democrat Martens could cost the party a great deal in the coming poll.

[Levin] But coming back to global problems, it has to be said once again that the main thing is to combine and build up efforts in the cause of preventing an arms race in space and stopping the arms race on earth. It is precisely in this direction, as the decision of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo says, that the Soviet Union will exert its efforts at the Soviet-American talks which began recently in Geneva; it is in this direction that we act in all international forums. It is our sincere desire that the negative development of international relations be stopped, that an end be put to the arms race, that detente be revived, and that in Europe, which stands on the threshold of the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Final Act of the European conference, that this date should be marked not as a remembrance of the past, but as a stimulus for the further development of the process of pan-European cooperation and security.

[Shishlin] And, Viktor Nikolayevich, it has to be said that the fate of the Geneva talks depends not only on the efforts of diplomats and of the Soviet and American representatives there. The fate and success of Geneva also depends on the actions of social forces, of diverse political circles, in the socialist, capitalist and nonaligned countries.

[Levin] Yes, the efforts of the most varied social and political forces of the day are now directed towards the prevention of nuclear war. Directed towards this goal are the large-scale, peace-loving initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community. They are in harmony with the decisions of the United Nations, which express the views of the world community of states. The public and leaders of many countries of the world are clearly in favor of a return to the policy of detente, an end to the arms race, and the development of a political dialogue and cooperation between states. This is resolutely supported by the antiwar movement, which has now become a major public and political force in many countries. There is growing understanding of the fact that in the 21st age the security of states cannot be built on force or the threat of force: it is possible only in the sense of security for all. All this strengthens one's conviction that, given the necessary efforts, it is possible to achieve a turn around in the situation and an improvement in the international climate.

[Shishlin] The problem of curbing the arms race concerns everyone, it is a common cause. The fact that understanding of this is growing is, of course, quite vital, and is an encouraging element in today's international realities.

[Levin] On that, we end our program for today. Thank you, dear comrades, for listening.

U.S. 'Far From Realistic'

PM261052 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Mar 85 First Edition p 4

[Boris Kotov "International Review"]

[Excerpt] When Will Realism Prevail?

People all over the world are pinning great hopes on the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons which have just started in Geneva. In the Soviet leadership's opinion, expressed during M.S. Gorbachev's 22 March meeting with the Socialist International's consultative council on disarmament, progress at these talks and their fruitfulness depend primarily on whether both sides adhere rigorously to all parts of the accord reached regarding the subject and objectives of the talks. For its own part, the Soviet Union will do everything within its power to implement the agreement in question. The USSR will judge the U.S. side's intentions by its practical actions. It is necessary for each side to display goodwill and the readiness for reasonable compromises and -- most importantly -- for the principles of equality and identical security to be strictly observed.

To all appearances, however, official Washington is still very far from a realistic approach toward the problems under discussion in Geneva. Leading U.S. Administration figures remain captive to dangerous illusions, believing that an unrestrained buildup of military preparations, the further unleashing of more and more new rounds of the arms race, and its transfer to space constitute "the key," as one transatlantic newspaper put it, which will supposedly make it possible to open the road to success in Geneva and force "the Russians to back down." However, it has long been well known that any attempts to talk with the Soviet Union "from a position of strength" are a futile venture.

Unfortunately, however, the thinking in Washington departments still continues to operate on this plane. With a sophisticated persistence worthy of some better application, the U.S. Administration is now seeking to get the U.S. Congress to approve the \$1.5 billion of appropriations requested for the production of the next batch of MX ground-launched heavy nuclear ICBM's, which, as eminent U.S. specialists admit, are first-strike offensive weapons.

Unprecedented pressure was exerted on hesitant legislators by the President and his immediate entourage before the vote in the Senate, which approved these appropriations by a small majority.

The President personally went to the Congress building at the crucial moment to give the senators his "last-minute instructions" a few hours before the vote. The main argument which was put forward here boiled down to the claim that a refusal to approve the MX missile production program would virtually doom the Geneva talks to failure. In the President's words, this would be "an incorrect signal to Moscow at an inappropriate time." On the other hand, a vote in support of the MX missiles would "demonstrate to the Soviet Union America's unity and its resolve to struggle for the cause of peace."

A logic that is equally distorted and remote from present-day realities can be perceived in the feverish activity currently launched by the administration around the program for the militarization of space. Paramount attention is now

being devoted to the task of involving by every means the United States' NATO allies in the "star wars" project, which is dangerous for the cause of world peace. It is obvious that by no means the least reason behind this is the desire to lend to the project a certain "Atlantic respectability" and to attempt to pacify influential political "fault finders" both at home in the United States and in Western Europe, in the allied countries.

The U.S. President's visit to Canada was a noteworthy step in this campaign. A number of documents involving Canada still more deeply in Washington's military preparations were signed there, and agreement was obtained from Ottawa's Conservative government to support the "star wars" project. Furthermore, the U.S. President made sharp attacks on the USSR in his speeches during the visit, which, as Britain's THE GUARDIAN suggests, by no means without reason, can only "cloud the atmosphere at the Geneva talks."

Nevertheless, criticism of Washington's militarist aims has not only not subsided, but is actually becoming increasingly vocal with every passing day.

In a review article devoted to the Geneva talks, London's THE OBSERVER concluded last Sunday that "enthusiasm for President Reagan's strategic defense initiative has diminished" in West Europe. In other words, any illusions that some people there may have nurtured regarding the beneficial nature of the venture to create the pseudodefensive American "space shield" are beginning to dissipate like smoke.

In recent remarks by British Foreign Secretary G. Howe, who declared in particular that the "star wars" concept could lead to an acute destabilization of the international situation, have prompted a great reaction. In an interview with the American weekly TIME, French Premier L. Fabius expressed his belief that the implementation of the so-called "strategic defense initiative" will lead to the opening up of new spheres for the arms race, as a result of which the approximate balance of forces prevailing in the world will be disrupted.

A certain confusion on the "star wars" question has emerged even in such an "orthodox" NATO capital as Bonn. Is this not indicated by an eloquent report carried by the newspaper DIE WELT 20 March: "The FRG Foreign Ministry yesterday sent instructions to its official missions abroad to explain in their host countries that complete unity of views exists between Chancellor H. Kohl and Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher on the question of Reagan's strategic defense initiative?" Obviously, there are grounds to doubt this.

Encountering opposition to its plans for the militarization of space, Washington is making serious efforts to neutralize it. It has elaborated and has started to implement a broad program to pressure West European countries and involve the military-industrial complex in NATO states in direct participation in the development of the "star wars" project. What is highlighted in this is the dollar bait in the shape of the large profits to be made from fulfilling American orders, which is highly tempting for many West European companies.

General James Abrahamson, program leader, and George Keyworth, science adviser to the President, have taken to visiting West Europe. Unpublicized meetings are held with



leaders of West European conservative mass news organs with the aim of providing propaganda support for the plans to develop space weapons. The NATO allies are threatened with a "technological lag" if they decline to participate in the implementation of these plans and are tempted with the mind-boggling figures of the appropriations planned for this purpose.

The French newspaper LA TRIBUNE DE L'ECONOMIE has joined this propaganda chorus: "The United States is to spend 30 billion dollars just on research in the sphere of laser technology and on the creation of beam weapons, and the development of electronic control systems will cost an additional 50 billion dollars." According to a report by a REUTER correspondent, a group of officials in Bonn representing three ministries has prepared a special report on the question of attitudes toward the project. The report's authors urge that "immediate political considerations be set aside and that West German participation in scientific research within the framework of the strategic defense initiative be ensured in the very near future."

As we can see, some people are swallowing the transatlantic bait. But by no means everyone is. Richard Perle, U.S. assistant secretary of defense, blurted out before a Senate committee that "the NATO countries are worried" that the technology that it is planned to develop within the framework of the "star wars" project will be "meant only for the defense of the United States."

Along with advertising the "temptations" of the program for space militarization, Washington is maintaining its tactics of "strongarming" and crude pressure on the question of the further deployment of new U.S. nuclear means on the territory of several West European countries. Belgium's Government failed to withstand the weight of this pressure in the last few days. With its agreement the first 16 nuclear-tipped cruise missiles were hastily delivered to the Florennes military base. In fact, it was the Reagan administration instead of the Belgian parliament that was the first to learn of this decision by the Martens government. This gave socialist member of parliament A. van der Bist grounds to declare: "On the missiles question Belgium acted not as a NATO ally of the United States, but as its vassal without any sign of independence."

Peace-loving Belgium responded with an angry protest to the actions of its rulers and their transatlantic patrons. The antiwar demonstrations that swept the country last week merged into the mighty wave of mass demonstrations by fighters for the preservation of peace, which are gathering strength everywhere. The demands that U.S. first-strike missiles that threaten a catastrophe be removed from European soil, that the transatlantic plans for the militarization of space be canceled, and that a constructive and reasonable approach to the Geneva talks be displayed at long last -- which is something that Washington still cannot make up its mind to do -- are being voiced increasingly urgently and loudly and are becoming truly worldwide.

#### Matveyev Commentary

PM261300 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Mar 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Vikentiy Matveyev "Political Observer's Opinion": "No Time To Lose"]

[Text] The new Soviet-U.S. talks that have started in Geneva are attracting close attention in the world. Of course, this is understandable. Will it be possible to embark on curtailing the arms race on earth and preventing an arms race in space? It is clear to people unversed in the subtleties of politics



just what is at stake in the talks. Does this mean that the efforts of constructive diplomacy can be restricted to the Geneva forum, that apart from this forum there are no other opportunities for action in the interests of improving the situation?

The struggle against the threat of war and in favor of real steps in the disarmament sphere is being waged on many sections of the long "peace front." The adventuristically inclined imperialist forces are not trying to get their own way merely on a local scale. "Globalism"--that slogan of theirs betrays far-reaching schemes. When the Pentagon chiefs think that conditions are in their favor, they take immediate action.

A recent example is Belgium. Hardly had the country's government, under intense pressure from overseas, voted in favor of deployment before U.S. missiles immediately began being delivered to Belgium. This was despite the fact that, according to the bourgeois press itself, three out of four Belgians are against the deployment of U.S. missiles on the country's territory.

There was no delay. The speed of this "reaction," if one may call it that, contrasts with the voices overseas that think it possible to forecast years, if not decades of work for the Geneva talks!

The international public will hardly agree to tolerate a "snail's pace" with regard to something that cannot be postponed and is, without exaggeration, a question of life or annihilation. Every day of the continuing arms race means the accumulation of deadly new types of more and more sophisticated equipment and, consequently, materially more and more wasteful, creating the most terrible threat that mankind has ever encountered in its entire history.

The realization of this harsh truth undoubtedly explains the recent initiative by Democratic Senator Paul Simon and Republican Senator Mark Hatfield in the United States in submitting a draft resolution for Senate examination calling for the introduction of a joint Soviet-U.S. moratorium on the testing and deployment of new strategic weapons systems during the Geneva talks and a similar moratorium on the testing of any strategic nuclear warheads underground, at sea, in the atmosphere, or in space.

The resolution's authors are guided by sensible motives to promote the creation of a favorable atmosphere around the just begun Geneva talks between the USSR and the United States.

Their initiative reflects the growing concern not only of broad strata of ordinary Americans, but of many members of Congress, at the new programs for accelerating nuclear arms that are being strenuously pushed through by the Reagan administration. For instance, Senator A. Specter of Pennsylvania has recently received, in his words, thousands of letters and phone calls from people, 90 percent of whom are opposed to Congress' approval of appropriations for the MX missiles. On the other hand, the White House has recently mobilized all means of pressure to win approval for this spending.

The appearance of these new U.S. missiles will not ease, but complicate the atmosphere around the Geneva talks. Warnings about this are being issued by sober-minded politicians in the United States and other Western countries. There is no time to lose. The world public does not want to wait forever for the international horizon to clear.

9 May 1985

Without belittling the importance of the problems on the talks' agenda, it should be recalled that there are questions relating to nuclear arms which, although not a subject of examination at Geneva, are nevertheless amenable to independent resolution, and in the very near future, too.

This was stated by the U.S. side during the January meeting between A.A. Gromyko and G. Shultz in Geneva. Questions such as the possibility of concluding an agreement on ending nuclear weapons tests, freezing nuclear arsenals, bringing into force the treaty signed several years ago between the USSR and the United States on peaceful nuclear explosions, and ensuring the adoption by the nuclear powers of a commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons were cited in this regard.

This is yet another broad arena for the actions of constructive diplomacy, an arena where the ground has already been well prepared for positive accords. Lip service is paid to this theme from official rostrums in the United States, but the situation needs positive action and more action!

That is the thinking of the broad strata of the world public, including the American public. There is much evidence of that. One can cite what was stated in a 20 March talk with A.Ye. Karpov, chairman of the Soviet Peace Fund, by the eminent U.S. public figures Admiral Eugene Carroll (retired), chairman of the Information Center for Defense Problems in Washington, and James Tierney, executive director of the U.S. Peace Fund. During the talk, the American guests spoke of the serious concern of the U.S. public at the situation currently prevailing in the world, above all, the further buildup of the arms race on a global scale. E. Carroll reported the initiative taken by the center he heads -- an appeal to the U.S. Government to announce a moratorium on all further U.S. nuclear weapons tests on 6 August this year, that is, the 40th anniversary of the dropping of the Atom bomb on Hiroshima. According to him, this appeal has drawn wide public support.

Useful initiatives are being put forward by public groups and organizations in other countries dictated by the same desire: to promote the cause of universal peace through practical steps, not tomorrow or the day after tomorrow, but right now.

A session of the WPC Presidium is currently under way in Moscow. Eminent public figures from many countries have converged on our capital. Welcoming the foreign public's envoys, Soviet people are expressing confidence in the possibility of progress along the road of lasting peace and real disarmament.

#### PRAVDA Comment

PM262049 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 85 First Edition p 5

[Article by B. Dubrovin, PRAVDA correspondent: "Justifying Hopes"]

[Text] Geneva [no date given] - Two weeks have elapsed since new talks on nuclear and space armaments began here between delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States.

One must immediately remark that the word "new" is not fortuitous in this context. The fact is, some people here -- politicians, diplomats and representatives of the mass media -- very stubbornly attempt in speeches, conversations, and articles to pass off the start of these completely new negotiations as a "resumption" of the old

ones that were blocked at the end of 1983 by the Washington administration. This is by no means "forgetfulness" or "carelessness" in terminology, but a well thought-out propaganda action. One can easily trace the desire of certain Western circles to make every effort to belittle the importance of the negotiations now under way and to accustom people to the idea that there is allegedly nothing special in these talks and that one should hardly expect anything significant in the near future from the dialogue in Geneva.

Patently in accordance with a scenario worked out in advance, items that are more or less identical in tone have appeared in a number of bourgeois organs of the Western press in which the failure of the negotiations that have only just begun is predicted almost without any camouflage.

Of course, it is premature to talk just now about any concrete results. Very difficult and earnest work lies ahead which will naturally require not only time, but -- what is most important -- the will and desire of the sides to achieve positive results.

The talks are being conducted strictly on the basis of the accords that were agreed upon at the meeting of the USSR foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state in Geneva 7-8 January. As is known, at the time it was precisely and clearly defined that the subject of the negotiations would be "the range of questions concerning space and nuclear arms -- strategic and medium-range -- all these questions being examined and resolved in their interconnection." Both sides also jointly defined the aim of the Geneva dialogue: to draw up effective accords aimed at preventing the arms race in space and ending it on earth, at limiting and reducing nuclear arms, and at consolidating strategic stability. Ultimately, in the opinion of the sides, the Geneva talks, as well as efforts in general in the sphere of limiting and reducing arms, must lead to "the total liquidation of nuclear weapons everywhere."

The Soviet-American talks are taking place behind closed doors. As was agreed, the delegations are working in strict confidentiality. Apart from brief announcements of the fact that the latest meeting of the USSR and U.S. delegates has taken place, no details are being published about the nature and content of the discussions. Press conferences and briefings for journalists are not being held. However, the principled stance of the Soviet Union at these talks is no secret. As has been repeatedly firmly and authoritatively stated in Moscow, the Soviet Union is not seeking to achieve one-sided advantages over the United States and the NATO countries, nor is it seeking military superiority over them. The Soviet side wants the cessation and not the continuation of the arms race, and it therefore proposes a freeze on nuclear arsenals and the ending of further missile deployment. The USSR indeed wants a major reduction of stockpiled armaments, and not the creation of more and more new weapons systems, whether in space or on earth.

The course of the negotiations will show what stance the United States will adopt: a constructive one in line with the accords adopted, or an obstructionist one aimed at deceiving the public, at dragging out the talks, and at using them as a screen for implementing very dangerous plans for the militarization of space and for achieving military superiority over the USSR and its Warsaw Pact allies. However, even now, just 2 weeks after the start of the dialogue, a number of facts cannot fail to make observers wary.

Thus, having declared last Friday that the first stage of the plenary sessions had ended and that subsequent work would be transferred to the groups, a representative of the American delegation began, as the saying goes, "to cloud the issue." To the

question: "In which groups will the discussions be continued?" he said that he "could not remember" how many there were in total and, still less did he know in what kind of groups the work would continue.

This statement was assessed in local journalistic circles as poorly disguised reluctance on the part of the Americans to earnestly and constructively discuss the problem of prohibiting the militarization of space. At the talks here, the United States would merely like, according to certain Western journalists accredited in Geneva, to "explain the significance" of the so-called "strategic defense initiative" of Washington or, to put it in simple terms, the aggressive "star wars" program. To "explain" but to try to avoid a businesslike and serious discussion of the question of space.

Of course it is too early to make forecasts about how the talks will go, but it is worth recalling that a firm accord exists. The talks will encompass three spheres: space, nuclear strategic armaments, and medium-range nuclear armaments.

Moreover, it has been agreed that the questions of nuclear and space armaments will be examined and resolved in their interconnection.

Attention has been drawn here to the speech by U.S. representative Donald Lowitz at the Disarmament Conference that is taking place in the Palais des Nations. Turning everything upside down, he asserted that "all states present in this hall" are allegedly "interested not just in the peaceful use of space, but also in its use for military purposes." Trumpeting the U.S. "strategic defense initiative" in every way, the speaker went so far as to say that it is allegedly of greater benefit to the world community to "agree to reorganize the foundations of strategic stability," that is, to proceed to disrupt the existing equilibrium on which international security is based. The opinion of many local observers is right in considering that the U.S. "star wars" program is a camouflaged attempt by the United States to achieve strategic superiority over the Soviet Union. This attempt, let us bluntly state, is doomed to failure because the Soviet Union will not allow anyone to ever achieve military superiority over it or to disrupt the existing military balance.

Possibly it would not be worth dwelling on this speech were it not for the "revelation" by Washington's representative that the preparation for the implementation of the "star wars" program will be continued and that the plans for the creation of an "antimissile shield" allegedly do not contravene the provisions of the unlimited 1972 Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems and that in this spirit the "United States will undoubtedly raise this question at the bilateral talks" here in Geneva. Evidently his speech was a propaganda action planned in advance, aimed not only at duping public opinion as regards the aggressive nature of the "star wars" program, but also at making the holding of the bilateral Soviet-American talks more difficult.

World public opinion cannot be duped by talk to the effect that "star wars" is only at the scientific development stage at the moment. People recall that the atom bomb was the fruit of scientific research in the framework of the Manhattan Project. It is known how this turned out for the inhabitants of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Since then, the whole world and the Americans themselves have been living under the shadow of nuclear weapons. An awesome danger must not now be allowed to emanate from space.

One of the oldest Swiss clock firms, when advertising its products, asserts: "Time is more than just hours and minutes." One cannot help but agree with that. Time is indeed not just hours and minutes; it is also our future. It is important not to lose time, but to justify the hopes that the peoples of the world are pinning on the Geneva talks.

CSO: 5200/1061



## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### COMMENTS ON ARMS CONTROL DURING CLARK VISIT TO USSR

#### Talks Begin

LD031254 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1116 GMT 3 Apr 85

[Excerpts] Moscow, 3 Apr (TASS)--Talks were held in the Kremlin today between Andrey Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR minister of foreign affairs, and Joseph Clark, Canada's secretary of state for external affairs, who is in the USSR on an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

There was an exchange of views on topical international problems and questions of bilateral Soviet-Canadian relations in a businesslike atmosphere.

In conditions of the increased tension in the world, Andrey Gromyko stressed, the Soviet Union's foreign policy is aimed primarily at securing a decisive turn for the better in the development of events in the international arena. We shall continue to increase our efforts toward preserving peace and curbing the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race.

The Soviet Union is acting from these positions at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on questions of nuclear and space arms. The achievement of the aims of the talks -- to avert the militarization of space, to stop the arms race on earth, and to radically reduce nuclear arms -- is possible, of course, only with the presence of a counter-movement on the part of the United States.

The Canadian minister set forth his government's approach to the problems discussed at the conference, including in relation to the principle of nonuse of force to resolve problem areas in relations between states.

#### Gromyko Speech at Luncheon

PM040903 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Apr 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Soviet-Canadian Talks"]

[Excerpts] We are satisfied, Mr Minister, that an understanding reached between the two sides has given us and you an opportunity to exchange opinions on questions of Soviet-Canadian relations. Due attention, of course, is also being paid to questions of the international situation and world politics.

Concern for safeguarding peace and removing the threat of a nuclear catastrophe comes uppermost on mankind's mind today. Millions upon millions of people in all continents have become active, protesting the militarist course in external affairs. The people condemn the continuing race in arms, especially nuclear arms. They are strongly opposed to militarization of outer space and demand that the proposals put forth by peace-loving states, including the Soviet Union, be examined very seriously. They demand that decisions be made in line with the greatest and loftiest goal -- general and complete disarmament, above all, reduction, and then, the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

The road toward fulfilling this historic task is obstructed by those forces which have set themselves the aim of dominating the world through attaining military superiority. The Soviet Union and its allies, like a majority of states of the world, condemn the policy course of those forces. Equality and equal security is the principle which should be unswervingly adhered to by the powers conducting talks on disarmament and curbing the arms race. This goes, above all, for the United States of America and the Soviet Union in connection with the negotiations which they opened at Geneva.

We stand for the strict fulfillment of the agreement reached in January of this year on the subject and objectives of these negotiations. That the Soviet Union will not depart from it should be clear to our partners in the negotiations. The USSR stood and stands for respecting agreements reached with its participation. It stands for strict observance of the commitments assumed by states, who are parties to these agreements. In this case I am speaking of the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

I would like to recall the words of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, M.S. Gorbachev: The only reasonable way out of the existing situation is agreement of the confronting forces on an immediate termination of the race in arms, above all, nuclear arms, on earth and its prevention in space. This is the guideline of our policy in the external affairs field.

It is an axiom that huge material and intellectual resources are currently expended on the production of weapons for the extermination of people, the mass annihilation weapons. Hundreds of billions, trillions -- no matter in which currency arms production expenditures are expressed -- are dumped into an abyss. This happens at the time when the achievements of science, the productive potential of mankind could, in case of their correct utilization, yield huge benefits and, in the first place, remove the threat of a catastrophe, the distance of which is steadily decreasing in the conditions of the continuing arms race.

#### Clark Speech at Luncheon

LD031657 Moscow TASS in English 1635 GMT 3 Apr 85

[Excerpt] Moscow 3 Apr (TASS)--Following is the speech made by Canadian Foreign Minister Joe Clark at a luncheon given in his honour by member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Foreign Affairs Minister of the USSR Andrey Gromyko.

Joe Clark said that his visit to the Soviet Union attests to the Canadian Government's conviction that contacts promote mutual trust and contribute to lessening international tension. It would be naive to deny the presence of profound differences between Canada and the Soviet Union, but these differences themselves convincingly persuade the sides to multiply their efforts to understand each other. We all live on the same planet and share the same human nature, he said. Hence, man's perennial striving to live in peace.

That is why people in Canada and, probably, all over the world were especially satisfied with the beginning of talks in Geneva between the United States and the Soviet Union, Joe Clark pointed out. Undoubtedly, the talks will be difficult. Complex issues are being discussed, and the differences between the two sides are great. But the objectives of these talks are of vital importance for all of mankind, and it is the duty of statesmen to apply maximum effort to look for accords. The interests of many others, including Canada, are also on the negotiating table. That is why Canada will continue to attach great importance to a successful completion of the Geneva talks.

Achieving a higher level of trust in East-West relations is to become the key factor ensuring the continuation of the process of talks. This is far from being a simple task.

#### TASS Press Conference Report

LD051152 Moscow TASS in English 1128 GMT 5 Apr 85

[Excerpts] Moscow, 5 Apr (TASS)--Canada's Foreign Minister Joe Clark said here today that during his visit to the USSR he had an extensive and useful exchange of views with the USSR Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko and other Soviet leaders on a wide range of bilateral and international problems.

Joe Clark said that questions of preventing the militarization of outer space were discussed in principled aspect during the talks in Moscow. He tried to justify the known position of the United States Administration in respect to the "star wars" programme saying that at present the United States was engaged only in "research" in this field.

He also said that his government had not yet decided on Canada's participation in this "research" despite the proposal made by the Americans.

Asked about reports in the Western press about the possible deployment of American nuclear missiles on Canadian territory the foreign minister of Canada said that there were no and would be no nuclear arms on Canadian soil. Canada, he said, firmly adheres to the provisions of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

Noting the exceptional importance of the talks in Geneva Joe Clark stressed that the Soviet Union was very seriously approaching the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms. In his opinion the success of these talks would be facilitated also by advance along other directions of international cooperation in the field of restricting the arms race and disarmament. In particular he noted his country's interest in the achievement of an agreement banning chemical and radiological weapons and in progress at the Stockholm conference. At the same time the minister repeated the known position of NATO countries on a number of international problems.

AFP Press Conference Report

AU051233 Paris AFP in English 1223 GMT 5 Apr 85

[Excerpts] Moscow, 5 Apr (AFP)--The Canadian external affairs secretary, Joe Clark, plans to raise the issue of human rights in the Ukraine during his current eight day tour of the Soviet Union, he said at a press conference here today.

Turning to East-West relations and disarmament, Mr Clark said "differences" remained between the two sides. He said he had discussed with Mr Gromyko the NATO and Canadian positions.

On the Geneva arms talks, Mr Clark said the United States and the Soviet Union alike had approached the talks seriously and should broaden their scope. Mr Clark said he had had "specific discussions" with Mr Gromyko on the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative, aimed at destroying incoming missiles, and said Canada did not oppose U.S. research into this project. Asked whether Canada would accept U.S. arms, Mr Clark said Canada would never have nuclear arms on its territory because it was not in "our interest."

CSO: 5200/1093

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### MULRONEY REPORTS REMARKS TO GORBACHEV ON GENEVA TALKS

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 15 Mar 85 pp A1, A4

[Article by David Vienneau]

[Text]

OTTAWA — Prime Minister Brian Mulroney has told new Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev that Canadians are praying for success at the Geneva arms control talks because of their deep desire to avoid nuclear war.

"I conveyed to him the deep and genuine concerns of all Canadians about the (arms negotiation) process and why it must not be allowed to fail," a weary-looking Mulroney said last night.

Mulroney, who had a 45-minute meeting in Moscow with the new Soviet boss earlier in the day, said he made his comments knowing full well that success at the Geneva arms talks will not be easy.

"It's going to be a long and difficult process," Mulroney told reporters after an 10-hour flight aboard a Canadian Forces plane from Moscow, where he attended the funeral of Gorbachev's predecessor, Konstantin Chernenko.

"Both sides have reservations about the other," he said. "What we must do is help dissipate those and contribute to a climate where in productive negotiations can take place."

The Prime Minister said he will convey the contents of his talks with Gorbachev to U.S. President Ronald Reagan when the two meet at the Shamrock summit in Quebec city on Sunday and Monday.

The question of a summit between the U.S. and Soviet leaders was not addressed during the Moscow meeting, he said.

Upon leaving Moscow, Mulroney told reporters, he indicated to Gorbachev the extent to which "I believed that President Reagan is genuinely committed to the process and an end result of arms reductions and limitation."

"I can only assume that . . . Gorbachev feels no less committed to the process."

But last night, Mulroney appeared to dismiss suggestions he wants to act as a sort of "honest broker" between the two superpowers.

"I was there as a representative of the Government of Canada," he said, but noted that no possibilities should be excluded.

Mulroney told reporters he was impressed with Gorbachev, and said he is convinced the new Soviet leader will be "helpful to (the) process" because he understands the challenge facing his country at Geneva.

"What I saw in two meetings with him is a man who is extremely competent, extremely intelligent," Mulroney said. "A man who



knows exactly what he is about. He understands the dimensions of the challenge and his responsibility in the process as well."

The Prime Minister said he did discuss the U.S. government's controversial "Star Wars" space weapon research project and that Gorbachev "finds it an unacceptable acceleration of the (arms) process."

Mulroney said Gorbachev "is himself, unquestionably in my judgment, in command. The sense of presence and authority, and I don't mean that in an overbearing way, is something he seems to wear quite naturally."

While in Moscow, Mulroney also met with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl and Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone to discuss their relations with Canada and the upcoming May economic summit in Bonn.

CSO: 5220/03

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

LOMEYKO, ANATOLIY GROMYKO VIEW HOW TALKS WILL AFFECT EUROPE

DW271302 Cologne Westdeutscher Rundfunk Television Network in German 2000 GMT  
25 Mar 85

[Netherlands Television Network's roundtable "The Zvolle Summit" broadcast "last week" with the following participants: Anatoliy Gromyko, member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and Kremlin adviser, Vladimir Lomeyko, spokesman of the USSR Foreign Ministry, Gerd Ruge, chief editor of Cologne Westdeutscher Rundfunk Network, John Vinocur, Paris correspondent of THE NEW YORK TIMES, and Willem Brugsma, the moderator of the roundtable; all questions in English, answers in Russian, with superimposed German translation]

[Excerpt] [Lomeyko] Our plans are well known, and I believe the most important point that we can bring up even now is the fact that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has been pursuing, and will pursue quite consistently in the future as well, the foreign policy of our country, meaning the political line mapped out for decades by our state and our party. An example of this is his first speech during the Central Committee plenum after his election as general secretary. In this speech Gorbachev emphasized that our party and our state, the Soviet Union, will consistently continue to pursue the policy of peace and of peaceful coexistence with the West, meaning a policy of detente and cooperation.

[Vinocur] I am fascinated by Mr Gorbachev, especially by his age. I would like to ask our Soviet friends: What differences does it make to us in the West that Mr Gorbachev is 54 years old? What can we expect with regard to his age, to the great age difference with his most recent predecessors?

[Gromyko] I believe it is all the better the younger a statesman is. After all, health is an important factor for a man and his job. On the other hand, John Vinocur, I believe that we should take an even closer look at our policy. We have a collective leadership, decisions are made at party meetings. We have a consistent policy. We do not shift from one side to the other as other states sometimes do.

In short, the line of our policy of the 26th party congress will be pursued under the new leadership as well. I can assure you that the 27th party congress will also deal with the foreign policy problems. The strength and power in our foreign policy lies in its clear predictability, with people knowing what to expect from it.

[Brugsma] Gromyko used the word consistency in foreign policy, Mr Lomeyko, and I therefore would like to proceed to the other and most important political events of this week, that is to say, to the start or, if you will, the continuation of the negotiations in Geneva. Why has the Soviet Union returned to Geneva? Just recently it said that first the Pershing II and the cruise missiles must be removed. This has not been done, yet the Soviet Union is in Geneva.

[Lomeyko] Let me say this, gentlemen: Coming to the same place does not mean returning. The ancient Greek philosopher Herodotus said you cannot step into the same river twice. Life, after all, continues to flow. Life changes continuously, and the Soviet delegation now has come to the old city of Geneva for new negotiations, for negotiations which have been newly prepared and arranged with the Soviet Union's approval, and which have nothing in common with preceding negotiations. This is a highly important factor which certain people who greatly desire, and even are anxious for, the Soviet Union's return to Geneva seek to obliterate.

The Soviet Union has sent its delegation to Geneva because the American side agreed to new negotiations offered by the Soviet Union and after mutual understanding had been reached on the points and the objective of these negotiations.

[Brugsma] Mr Ruge, do you believe that what usually is referred to as President Reagan's star wars project and -- officially -- SDI or, spelled out, Strategic Defense Initiative, this Maginot line in space, has contributed to the achievement of new negotiations, albeit not the continuation of the preceding negotiations?

[Ruge] I think that it had something to do with that, just as I believe that this is a highly important matter because it alarms the Soviet Union if the Americans go full force at the Strategic Defense Initiative with high technology in space.

[Brugsma] Mr Gromyko?

[Gromyko] It seems to me that you are dreaming politically, even though you are facing me open-eyed. We regard this Strategic Defense Initiative as an aggressive initiative which undermines Soviet security and which is aimed at undermining the security of the socialist countries and gaining the United States a position of military hegemony. However, the Soviet Union is an economically very powerful state and will never allow this.

[Vinocur] It is defensive. It is an attempt to get away from the spiral of mutual deterrence and to get away from the idea of having to fire missiles at another country, the Soviet Union or any other country of the Warsaw Pact. This is an attempt to have defense initiative which does not shoot at anybody with missiles, kill anybody in a town, has its position in space, and which would make it possible to break the backbone of what President Reagan referred to as the nuclear spiral. It is designed to put an end to the nuclear arms race which, in the final analysis, is immoral. Nobody will be killed by it.

[Lomeyko] Let us cast a glance back at mankind's history. It is quite simple. The weapons kept developing from the first knife and the first shield, and the better the shield was, the sharper became the blade of the knife and the sword. This is how we reached today's situation.

Today Mr Reagan and his aides propose a project which at first glance appears to be quite attractive. Why not? Why should one not create a sphere against intercontinental missiles that cannot be penetrated by any missile. The United States would live in peace and Reagan once said: let us share it with the East, though the latter is being said rather rarely now. First of all, and this is what the American scientists say and not the Russian scientists, this is what the Nobel Prize winners say, it is possible to invent a 100-percent defense. The project will swallow up gigantic funds, up to \$1 trillion. Let us assume that such a sphere, a defensive sphere, were created around the world. According to U.S. estimates its maintenance would require \$70-80 billion a year. This means that the money would simply be thrown into space.

[Brugma] Mr Ruge, where does this leave us poor Europeans?

[Ruge] SDI would never work in Europe against short range missiles. I believe that there is practically no option of defense, not during our lifetime, in any event. On the other hand, if nuclear warfare is ruled out, we will be confronted with the conventional arms race. This would be fantastically expensive, because we in Europe would then have to foot the bill for part of the U.S. research costs for SDI and, in addition, for costs of conventional armament in Europe. But we would hardly have any choice because the two superpowers, as far as I know, are operating at the utter limit of their ABM treaties. What I mean to say is that there has been Soviet research and work on killer satellites and super-radar which goes beyond the ABM treaty. The Americans are doing the same. Both sides claim to observe the treaty, but basically they are somewhat beyond it. Hence, we are in a very difficult situation.

[Brugma] Be it as it may, let us get down from space and back to earth. My government, the Government of the Netherlands, had decided not to allow the deployment of 48 cruise missiles in the Netherlands if by November the Soviet Union does not have more than 378 SS-20 missiles installed. What happened? Did Moscow not receive the message of Prime Minister Lubbers, or was it that you did not care?

[Lomeyko] Mr Brugma, I would like to tell you the following: We have not gathered for the purpose of counting the missiles on each side. The problem is not with the number. The problem of our century as I see it lies in the question whether the political leaders of the world are capable of outgrowing the old mode of thinking that is based on the fist and not on the mind, whether they are capable of recognizing a new epoch, because the nuclear age is fundamentally different from all previous eras. Mere counting will not get us anywhere. This is important.

[Brugma] Mr Lomeyko, you did not answer my question. What I said was: Did Moscow receive the Netherlands Government's message or did it not? Or did it make no difference to Moscow? This is a precise question.

[Gromyko] I would like to say something quite simple in this context. You count the missiles, we count the missiles. Of course, you do not wish to count the French and British missiles. So let us leave them aside for now. Thousands of nuclear weapons aboard U.S. aircraft carriers are permanently cruising off our coasts. Why -- and this is the answer to your question -- should all these missiles, Russian and American alike, not be removed? Why not?

[Brugma] Mr Ruge.

[Ruge] One question: You said that we need new ideas in the nuclear age. Do you believe, then, that it is good policy on the part of the Soviet Union to reply to the U.S. SDI with further offensive weapons production instead of with additional defensive weapons? Or should the Soviet side not embark on a new course in that respect?

[Lomeyko] We and many American scientists are saying that the Russians will find an answer to SDI. Why should we develop a system that would immediately eat up \$1 trillion if one knows from the outset that it will be ineffective when we need the money spent on the development of this project for the solution of social problems of our world?

[Vinocur] You know, I heard a new idea the other day. It came from the immediate environment of Leo Tindemans, the Belgian foreign minister. After Belgium had decided to go through with the NATO deployment, he said he went to see a gentleman who Mr Gromyko knows quite well--I mean his father--with the following proposal: We will not deploy if you agree that the continuation of the Geneva negotiations is not a condition, a pawn, for the discontinuation of the American SDI research. He said: We will not install the missiles if you say that this condition is not valid, and we will talk about everything, and we will annul the threat the Russians have imposed on the Geneva negotiations. When Mr Tindemans informed the Belgian newsmen about it, he said that Mr Gromyko did not give him an answer. He said no, and that was it. So there was such a new idea, and this idea would have halted and avoided the deployment. But it seems to me that the Soviet side has no intention to drop the threat to pull the rug out from under the Geneva negotiations again.

[Brugsma] It is a fact, Mr Gromyko, that the Soviet Union could easily get 96 cruise missiles off its back, 48 in Belgium and 48 in the Netherlands. It is your choice. Why do you not do it?

[Gromyko] It is also in your interest, because you need not be great scientists or an Isaac Newton to recognize that any action immediately produces a reaction. Any country deploying nuclear weapons that potentially threaten the Soviet Union or other socialist countries on its territory provokes an immediate reaction. This is why we support the proposal concerning the establishment of a denuclearized zone in northern Europe. A denuclearized zone is a very good idea. Why does your government fail to support it, and why does your government depreciate it all the time? And another thing: All questions we pose to ourselves lead us to one conclusion, namely, that we must freeze all nuclear weapons arsenals. Why are you against the freeze--I do not mean you personally, but the U.S. administration, the U.S. Government? Why should not all nuclear weapons arsenals be frozen? We propose it, we offer it, and we will never enhance our weapons arsenals.

[Brugsma] A question in return, Mr Gromyko: I am sure that all of us understand that the Soviet superpower wants to defend itself against the other superpower. But why on earth did the Soviet Union ever consider it necessary to target more than 1,000 S-20 missile warheads at the heads of us Europeans who have neither the ambition nor the means to follow in the footsteps of Napoleon Bonaparte or Adolf Hitler?

[Gromyko] But you stuffed Western Europe with nuclear weapons on four U.S. military bases directed against the Soviet Union. These weapons are not quite new but modernized. We must freeze them and then eliminate them. What we have to say over and over again is: Let us freeze all nuclear weapons and let us then remove them from Western Europe. Would this not be a good idea?



[Brugsma] Mr Ruge?

[Ruge] What alarms us is, of course, the installation of Soviet short-range weapons in East Germany and in Czechoslovakia which, I believe, must be regarded as first-strike weapons if they are to have any purpose. Are these to be frozen as well? So far there has only been talk about a freeze on the Pershing and SS-20 level. And this is not very satisfactory for the Europeans.

[Gromyko] I must tell you directly that if the Soviet Union says: Let us freeze, then it does so in reaction to the appeals of the world public including the American public which are in harmony with our concepts. What we mean is: Freeze of all existing nuclear potentials and arsenals so that we can halt this process and try to reduce the volume of nuclear armament.

[Brugsma] We will keep the freeze in mind.

[Vinocur] I am a bit concerned that you are lulling, especially our listeners in the Netherlands, to sleep because this involves an argument that is 3 years old. The American position on it has not changed. What they will tell you is: Remove all SS-20's and NATO will remove all cruise and Pershing missiles. They will say: Let us bring them down to zero. The same is true for the intercontinental missiles. We will say: Reduce them by thousands, reduce them to the lowest possible level. The freeze would keep them up. They would still be there and remain just as dangerous. Let us remove them for good.

[Brugsma] What I would like to say at this state of the game is: Let us get away from missiles and missile count because it is worthwhile to continue talking about the freeze.

[Ruge] I believe that the West and East European governments should, 10 years after Helsinki, think about calling on the superpowers to discuss the freeze of all missiles in Europe, short- and intermediate-range missiles alike. This will be worthwhile.

[Brugsma] In this connection, Mr Ruge, I do not know whether you do not slightly share my view. Europe reminds me of an elderly landlady in whose boarding house two guests reside who cannot stand each other but whom she cannot kick out. So she lives in the permanent anxiety that they will get at each other's throat some day and break all her good china in the process. Can we not ask the superpowers to relocate their quarrel to the Pacific, to the North Pole, or to space--no, not to space as we just arrived at the conclusion that this would not be such a good idea.

[Ruge] It sounds nice but I believe it will not work. Europe is part of the confrontation of the superpowers, and in effect the Soviet Union is part of Europe, of course. It will be very difficult. [Gromyko begins to interrupt] All right part of the Soviet Union is part of Europe. That makes it somewhat difficult. I think we cannot change the situation geographically. Hence, we must find something other than sending them away.

[Brugsma] Mr Gromyko, or Mr Lomeyko, or both of you: I remember that in 1957 another leader of the Soviet Union, Khrushchev, said that the Soviet Union is prepared to withdraw all its Armed Forces behind its national borders under the proviso that the United States does the same. Does this offer still stand?

[Lomeyko] I will answer this question. This cannot be solved today or tomorrow. If confidence exists, enhanced confidence and political and economic co-operation, many problems will be resolved. It is extremely important to take the first step and then to proceed step by step. We were the first to propose the nonuse of nuclear weapons, but the Americans refused to follow us. We would go even further. Let us dissolve the military blocs.

[Brugsma] Let us first consult the other superpower.

[Vinocur] The other superpower would like to know what the Europeans think about the proposal that the Soviet troops, about 500,000 men, withdraw behind the Soviet Union's border and that the U.S. troops leave Europe. The answer rests with the Europeans.

Will they feel safe and out of danger? Will they feel safe sometime in the future when the Soviets are behind their borders and the Americans have gone back to the United States? I do not know.

[Brugsma] What about the other European here?

[Kuge] Well, I do not think that the Europeans would feel very safe if something one-sided would occur or something that you described. If it can be done it would involve a long process, step by step which, of course, requires the emergence of understanding and confidence beforehand. I believe that the latter is absolutely necessary because it is impossible to simply push the two powers aside. This is why I believe that in the long run this is the direction in which the Western Europeans and also the Eastern Europeans should work.

[Brugsma] Go ahead, Mr Gromyko.

[Gromyko] I am very glad that you brought up this question because Europe is one of the oldest continents on earth with the richest culture and tradition, and historically linked with the Soviet Union. We have a great wealth of historical and intellectual values. If I understood you correctly, you believe that detente has disappeared from Europe or died. I must say that you are exaggerating a bit there. The significance of detente to us Europeans is, in my opinion, not the detente in Europe as it had been interpreted in the mid-seventies. But the idea of detente continues to exist in Europe. We can recognize new beginnings of detente. This detente process has struck very deep roots in Europe. What we need is some concrete measures which the Americans and Russians could both accept. This may be freezing or mutual commitments, or agreements in Geneva where we believe that it is possible to come to terms, because we have gone to Geneva with the feeling that a success should be scored because we must not bury detente. This does not mean enhancing the security of one side at the expense of the security of the other side.

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### NEW ZEALAND MP: NUCLEAR STAND MAY AFFECT GENEVA TALKS

Auckland THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD in English 11 Mar 85 p 6

[Article by Douglas Graham, National Party spokesman on disarmament and MP for Remuera: "NZ Nuclear Stand May Well Affect Big Talks"]

[Text]

**American and Russian negotiators are due to begin further talks on disarmament in Geneva on Wednesday (NZ time). New Zealand will look on with a good deal more hope than confidence that agreement will be reached.**

And it is this lack of confidence which has led the Government to make its non-nuclear stand in the belief that it may encourage the superpowers to agree.

These talks are very important, indeed. Since 1945 the various arms control treaties have sought to restrict either the number of nuclear weapons held by each side or the deployment of them throughout the world.

Some treaties have been very successful.

In 1961 the Antarctic Treaty successfully prohibited the establishment of military bases in Antarctica.

#### **Deployment Prevented**

Both the Outer Space Treaty and the Seabed Treaty which prohibited nuclear weapons or weapons of mass destruction being placed in orbit, on the moon, or on the seabed are still in force.

The treaties undoubtedly have prevented the

deployment of nuclear weapons by the superpowers.

Further, more than 120 countries have now ratified the Non Proliferation Treaty, under which they agree never to have nuclear weapons.

In return the nuclear powers agree not to supply nuclear weapons to them.

Under the Partial Test Ban Treaty, Britain, America and Russia agree that they will not test nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, outer space or under the sea. Unfortunately, France and China are not yet parties to that treaty.

New Zealand's position in all of this has been clear from the beginning. We have never been and never will be a nuclear power. We have ratified all the treaties and have initiated the establishment of a nuclear-weapons-free zone in the South Pacific.

Member states who join will undertake never to become nuclear powers

and neither to use, station nor store nuclear weapons on their land territory.

#### **Limitations Seen**

The nuclear powers will only recognise the zone, however, if their existing rights to cross international waters are preserved.

Thus, even in a nuclear-weapons-free zone there will still be nuclear-capable ships and, further, each member will be entitled to maintain alliances that each may have and to decide individually, whether or not to allow ship visits by their respective allies.

The zone is intended to achieve, however, a formal guarantee by the nuclear powers that they will never use nuclear weapons against the zone members.

While the zone clearly is useful, its limitations should not be underestimated.

## ***Deterrent Policy***

The treaties and proposals to date certainly have been helpful.

What has not been achieved despite 15 years of talks is a satisfactory reduction in existing nuclear weapons arsenals and the spread of nuclear weapon capability to other countries who for their own reasons have not ratified the various treaties.

This is due to the failure to reach agreement on suitable verification systems and the co-existing creative ingenuity of mankind which has perpetuated the arms race.

For four decades the superpowers have accepted the deterrent policy which involved each superpower seeking to maintain parity with the other.

Some people see the policy as a reign of terror which will lead to mutual assured destruction. Others see it as an arrangement which has proved successful.

No one as yet has been able to propose an alternative without an effective capitulation by one side. The lessons of history show how dangerous that can be.

To ensure the deterrent policy would work, the United States and the Soviet Union agreed in the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty that they would not develop extensive defensive shields to stop incoming missiles.

## ***Defensive Shields***

Each side accepted that conflict would best be avoided if the country attacked was capable of mounting a retaliatory strike.

Despite the treaty, however, both sides have continued to develop defensive programmes. The Soviets have been working on a nation-wide

defence system and America has begun a strategic defence initiative known as "Star Wars."

America hopes within the next 10 years to establish a missile defence shield using orbiting spacecraft to destroy missiles in flight in the atmosphere.

If developed unilaterally such a proposal would give America a distinct advantage and it is perhaps because of this that the Soviets have agreed to reopen negotiations.

There is, therefore, now a move from the deterrent policy based on a guaranteed retaliatory strike to a defensive posture, which prevents such a retaliatory strike.

The move can either be regarded as a serious change in superpower policy or the beginning of a system which could provide hope for permanent world peace.

The importance of the talks will, therefore, be clear.

As the ability to construct nuclear weapons will always be with us, many commentators see the development of defensive shields as the most practical way of rendering ballistic missiles obsolete.

Of course, such a defensive shield could destroy missiles from any country.

Obviously, however, if only one nuclear power has the defensive shield the other will see itself as at a disadvantage. The resulting tension is destabilising.

The answer lies in a joint effort by the superpowers to develop together such a defensive shield and to vest its control in an independent authority, established perhaps by the United Nations. The French

made similar suggestions in 1978.

The superpowers could be represented on the authority and it would be necessary to ensure that the authority was not susceptible to attack itself.

Whether this is a practical solution remains to be seen and will depend on the attitude of the superpowers.

If adopted, then a substantial portion of the nuclear arsenals would become immediately obsolete and genuine disarmament and arms reduction talks could then begin.

## ***Weakness Penalised***

It would not, of course, control medium or short-range nuclear weapons deployed in aircraft or submarines. In time, however, perhaps they too could be the subject of successful negotiations.

It is essential that the talks begin and make progress. All corners of the globe have a vested interest. Every country has an obligation to ensure that their policies do not jeopardise the talks.

Historically, arms control talks have only been successful when both superpowers gain an advantage which is not available to them by any other means.

Any weakness on either side has often resulted in the failure of negotiations.

New Zealand's recent stand and the reaction from its Western allies can only be seen from Moscow as a weakening of a position of strength.

It is to be hoped that this will not be used to delay the talks.

No country can now act alone without a ripple effect elsewhere. Let us remain optimistic that reason will prevail and the talks make progress towards peace.

SPACE ARMS

WEEKLY INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS SURVEYS VIEW SDI

PRAVDA Review 7 April

PM091150 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 85 First Edition p 4

[Yuriy Khalanov "International Review"]

[Excerpt] By Hook or by Crook

"An initiative which gives rise to a mass of doubts" -- this is how Britain's THE SUNDAY TIMES in one of its recent issues once again evaluates the American plans for the militarization of space, over which there were stormy debates once again last week both in Washington and in the capitals of the U.S. allies. Two years ago, when this initiative was first made public, the newspaper writes, it gave rise to many doubts and little joy. Skeptics at once called it "star wars," and, as one former American defense secretary said, "people chuckled." Now people no longer chuckle: Things are taking too serious a turn.

Indeed, Washington's plans to shift the arms race into space are now causing ever greater alarm in the world. In the United States itself the plans for the militarization of space are opposed not only by committed peace champions and mass antiwar organizations but also by many eminent figures in the leading political parties.

This criticism takes a whole number of directions, but the chief argument against the "star wars" plans is the fact that this project will inevitably lead to a new spiral of the arms race at an immeasurably more dangerous and costly level and will be a destabilizing element in the entire international situation. Former Democrat President J. Carter told THE NEW YORK TIMES that the program proposed by President Reagan erects an "insuperable obstacle" in the way of a U.S.-Soviet agreement in the sphere of limiting the arms race. The former president warns the present administration against attempts to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union by means of an unchecked increase in military spending. The Russians have demonstrated in the past that they will do everything to prevent themselves from lagging behind the United States, he said.

Replying to R. Reagan, who once again declared this week that he will not countenance any "compromise" with Congress in matters of reducing appropriations for the space arms program, C. Ferraro, former U.S. vice presidential candidate for the Democratic Party, said that the White House's attempts to take the "star wars" program out of the scope of the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms could torpedo the Soviet-American dialogue in the sphere of limiting arms.



A great many Americans now reject the pseudo-peace-loving phraseology of the White House and the hypocritical attempts to rechristen the MX missile — a first-strike weapon — as a "peacekeeper" and to call the crazy plans to shift the arms race into space the "Strategic Defense Initiative." "MX and 'star wars,'" L. Weicker, Republican senator from Connecticut, writes in THE WASHINGTON POST, "are not defensive arms: They are designed for waging nuclear war and, as such, they undermine strategic security." "The secret of 'star wars,'" the prominent American commentator T. Powers points out in THE LOS ANGELES TIMES, "is that this program is designed to defend arms, not people. The aim is not to deprive the Russians of the possibility of threatening us but to guarantee that we can threaten them."

This is what should be specially pointed out: While encountering sharp criticism of the space militarization program within its own country, in its external relations Washington presents the matter as though this question has already been decided and the whole of America has now rallied unanimously behind the White House. It only remains for the U.S. allies, it is said, to "fulfill the role of loyal but silent partners even when they totally disagree with the U.S. position," as Britain's THE OBSERVER wrote.

The desire to achieve a kind of reverse linkage is discernible in this policy. If Washington succeeds in involving its NATO allies and Japan, for example, in the "star wars" research program, then the U.S. Administration will find it easier to cope with opposition inside the country by alluding to the "solidarity" of the whole Western world.

This is why the propaganda indoctrination and pressuring of the U.S. partners in military blocs are being increasingly intensified with every passing week with a view to making them, by hook or by crook, abandon their objections and reservations relating to the space militarization plans. Everything has been set in motion: blackmail with "Soviet military superiority," deception as regards the true aims of the "star wars" program, speculation as to the possibility of the United States' sharing the latest technology with the allies, and even rude peremptory shouts and personal insults.

Thus, Assistant U.S. Secretary of State R. Burt recently tried in a most undiplomatic form to simultaneously stand to attention seven West European states which are partners of the United States. They had gathered, you see, to discuss arms control problems, including as regards "star wars," at a session of the Council of the Western European Union, to which France, the FRG, Britain, Italy, and the Benelux countries belong. In a special letter to the governments of the seven countries Burt warned them to abandon their attempts to achieve a common stand on arms control outside the NATO framework.

The Pentagon has also set itself the aim of exerting additional pressure on public opinion in the United States and its allies by issuing a new edition of the "Soviet Military Power" pamphlet. The text of the pamphlet itself, which contains many illustrations, and the commentary on it provided by Defense Secretary C. Weinberger have been compiled according to the guileless method of falsifiers. Accuse your opponent of what you do yourself. This "picture book" falsely accuses the Soviet Union of also preparing for "star wars," although in so doing its authors have not bothered to submit any real proof to back it up.

It is hard to guess whether Washington's propaganda tricks will make any impression. But one thing can be said: The unseemly maneuvers and the outright lies to which the defenders of the "star wars" program are now resorting once again accentuate its bankruptcy and show how dangerous these plans are and how much they are at variance with the aspirations of the world's peoples.

Observers Roundtable 7 April

LD071648 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 7 Apr 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Rudolf Georgievich Kolchanov, deputy editor in chief of TRUD; Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Lebedev, head of a MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN department; and Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, a political observer of All-Union Radio and Central Television--live]

[Excerpt] [Zholkver] Yes, and indeed last week marked another anniversary for NATO, the 36th, though it should be said, it is true, that this was done without any particularly joyful pronouncements. The treaty creating NATO was signed on 4 April 1949 in Washington. At that time there was a lot of talk about the North Atlantic alliance, the organization being set up as something that was going to serve peace, democracy, and human rights. However, it must be noted that the 3 and 1/2 decades that have passed have actually left nothing standing from all those loudly trumpeted statements.

What have these Atlantic politicians actually been doing for all these years and what are they doing now? First and foremost, obviously, they have been turning the screw of the arms race in different directions. In the past few days Lord Carrington, NATO secretary general, has announced that the 134 Pershing and cruise missiles have been deployed in countries of Western Europe, and they say that 542 U.S. missiles have to be deployed there. At the same time, as is known, production of MX strategic nuclear missiles is being speeded up in the United States itself.

Things are not confined solely to missiles. The name of U.S. General Rogers, the commander in chief of NATO, has been given to a new program, the Rogers plan, which is a program for building up conventional armaments, too. Most recently NATO has been acting -- you used the word generator -- well NATO has been acting as a generator of star wars. Now, since the session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group that was recently held in Luxembourg, it's a question of drawing the other NATO countries into the production of space weapons.

[Kolchanov] Well, I think before we say a few words on that subject, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, we should emphasize the special interest now being shown by Western propaganda -- above all by U.S. propaganda -- in star wars, or, as they're also called, antimissile defense with space-based elements. A few days ago, the booklet on the "Soviet military threat" was republished for the fourth time with a few amendments. It was promoted in a big way, with a press conference following publication, at which Weinberger spoke, and which was broadcast on television not only in the United States, but to many countries of Western Europe.

A wrong action always calls for inventiveness of a wrong sort, and here propaganda stepped in to heap sins onto the heads of others, and to bring up once again the pseudo-arguments by which they try to defend both the star wars idea itself and the process of preparing for star wars, as well as the process of duping the Western allies, or of roping them into the arms race in space.

Well, it's being asserted again that really, there is as yet no threat of space wars as such -- all that's happening, supposedly, is that scientific research is being carried out. But remember, on 1 September 1982 they set up the Space Command of

the U.S. Air Force; then the Navy acquired a similar command; and then last year came the establishment of the Joint Space Command of all the U.S. Armed Forces. What sort of peaceful scientific research is that?

Later, in July 1982, the President signed a decree setting up a so-called inter-departmental coordination group with the task of elaborating a space doctrine and concepts for the use of new technology. Finally, in March 1983, Reagan delivered his well-known program speech calling for intensive projects to develop weapons for destroying targets in space and earth targets from space. Currently, there are many reports in the U.S. press of concrete steps being taken by the Pentagon on the military path into space. Intensive work is in progress on a project to develop a laser weapon to be based on space.

A group of 50 astronauts is being trained exclusively to carry out missions; in January, you remember, there was the military flight of the space shuttle Discovery. In other words, of course there can be no question of this research being purely scientific. What is being developed is a so-called military shield -- actually a military sword -- in space to provide the ability to inflict a first, aggressive strike against the Soviet Union while they themselves try to evade retribution.

[Zholkver] There was an interesting article in THE WASHINGTON POST by Robert Kaiser. He states bluntly that the whole point of star wars is the prospect of fabulous new riches for the military-industrial complex, as President Eisenhower called it. That was his own expression, by the way: the military-industrial complex. That's in vogue interests this is being done. Various figures are being mentioned. In the first stage, General Abrahamson -- he's the head of the Space Command you mentioned, Rudolf Georgiyevich -- says that in the first stage, star wars will cost \$3.7 billion. But Senator Pressler says that between \$200 billion and \$300 billion will have to be spent on the laser weapon alone. It must be said that this is just what the huge U.S. companies foresee. It is reported, for example, that Rockwell International has already developed a special laser base called "Sigma Tau" -- that's in the suburbs of Los Angeles -- and anticipates receiving colossal military orders for the production of space weapons. It should be noted that, of course, it is with hope of such vast military allocations and, naturally, profits, that they're trying to bribe other countries, above all those with highly developed industries -- electronics especially -- such as the FRG and Japan.

[Kolchanov] They want to unload some of the work onto the shoulders of their competitors and partners, as it were.

[Ilebedev] And to pocket some of their technological achievements, you might say.

[Zholkver] Yes, and it should be said that in those countries -- both in the FRG and in Japan -- there are forces that would like for both political and for military-economic reasons to join in the development of space weapons. Take the FRG, for example, where there's a politician who has said, literally, the following: I unequivocally support Reagan's initiative. That means the space initiative. Who is this politician? It is Strauss.

[Kolchanov, interrupting] In Bavaria, of course, are the 11 major industrial complexes directly connected with space weapons. Aerospace weapons are in Bavaria. You, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, worked there for many years and remember that well. It's no accident that Strauss should be the one to speak of it. After all, he is linked

with these people, the managers and proprietors of these monopolies by the very closest of associations.

[Likhachev] Well, the political meaning of all this is also clear, because if they succeed in drawing the West European and other allies into this so-called research work, then obviously, there's only one step left to getting those countries politically engaged with the further scheme, the further project -- not just research.

[Kulchikov] It's a method, if you like, of carrying the subjugation or enslavement of Western Europe a step farther.

[Cholodover] Not only Western Europe; Washington is guided by exactly the same calculations in relation to Japan.

It's becoming well known in Washington that Japan possesses a high technical potential, particularly in matters of electronics and that this potential must be utilized for -- as they call it -- research in the field of the strategic initiative in space. There is much more than that. The American space weapons expert, General Scowcroft, is off to Japan. The way the Japanese is also to visit Japan. It's promised that in 1988 three Japanese astronauts will take part in a space flight aboard a shuttle-type craft; and some Japanese companies are, of course, not averse to warming their hands in this area. The major automobile motor corporation, Nissan, for instance, has concluded a big agreement with the U.S. firm of Martin Marietta. What is Martin Marietta? It is a firm engaged in rocket-propulsion technology. Now Nissan is also entering this field. Nissan rockets have already launched several of the Japanese space satellites. So certain interests are being aroused. On the other hand, these interests are coming up against the acute competition between the United States and Japan in economic matters, including again, particularly in electronics.

(S0) 3/10/1983

SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA'S ZHUKOV DENIES DEFENSIVE AIMS OF SDI

PM011535 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar 85 First Edition p 4

[Article by Yuriy Zhukov, political observer: "Treacherous Deception"--capitalized passages between slantlines originally published in boldface]

[Text] The present U.S. Administration has made tremendous efforts to lull the vigilance of the peoples perturbed by reports that the United States is preparing to militarize space.

For nearly 2 years the U.S. President himself and his cabinet have been claiming from one day to the next that it is merely a case of innocuous scientific research whose aim is to determine whether it is possible to create some kind of miraculous defensive weapons which would destroy not people but only enemy missiles so that the use of nuclear weapons would become impossible and they would therefore be destroyed. To this they invariably added that, in general terms, this was an unusually lengthy business and the research would produce results only in the 21st century. So why worry now?

However, the further we go, the more facts accumulate attesting to the fact that the U.S. leaders' reassuring declarations are a treacherous deception aimed at weakening the resistance growing everywhere, including in the NATO countries, to the plans to militarize space.

Fantasy or Reality?

When President R. Reagan came out on 23 March 1983 with his widely billed plan to create a "space shield" which would allegedly reliably protect the United States and its allies, many people, including eminent scientists, treated this plan skeptically, as a fantasy induced by Hollywood's "Star Wars" movies.

Of course, the creation of sophisticated types of weapons using lasers, high energy particle flows, and so forth is not something for the present. However, in the future these "exotic" weapons, as the U.S. press calls them, may be a tremendous threat to mankind.

It is no accident that the U.S. Administration, in pambling on "exotic" types of weapons of the future, is sparing no expense.

The initial stage of this program's development and implementation alone, planned for the period through the early nineties, will cost \$60 billion. This is four times more than the cost creating the atom bomb (the "Manhattan



Project") and 50 percent more expensive than all military scientific research in the sphere of missile technology over a 30-year period--from 1954 through 1983! These figures are contained in a report published 10 February by John (Payk), assistant director of the Federation of U.S. Space Research Scientists.

When you know how practical the Americans are, it is impossible to believe that it is planned to spend such enormous sums for the sake of mere curiosity--to see whether or not anything will come of the "research." But that is far from all. In billing "exotic" types of weapons for "star wars," whose creation will require prolonged effort, the U.S. spokesman mention only through clenched teeth another component of space weaponry--THE MISSILE SYSTEMS WHICH HAVE ALREADY BEEN DEVELOPED AND COULD BE DEPLOYED COMPARATIVELY SOON. It is no accident that, addressing the Senate Armed Services Committee 21 February, F. Ikle, U.S. undersecretary of defense, stated that the plan to prepare for "star wars" is "not a dangerous program" but "a central question of U.S. military planning." Here he said that the creation of a "partial defense system" designed to "protect U.S. missiles" (MISSILES!--Yu. Sh.) will begin in the nineties. Note that "prioritization," which is of extraordinarily great importance.

Whereas in March 1983 the U.S. President, in an attempt to make the plan to militarize space look attractive, unfoundedly alleged that the "space shield" was being created to defend the population of the United States and allied states. Now that the advertising campaign has ended, there is no longer any mention of that.

Now there is talk not of defending the population but merely of covering the 1,000 ICBM's on U.S. territory with the aid of antimissiles which (in contravention of the ABM defense limitation treaty) are being prepared there to be deployed partly on earth and partly in space.

#### Their Immediate Aim

THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote back on 23 December last year, citing authoritative sources: "The plan for the immediate future has been substantially reduced--it has been decided to turn from the attempt to create an impenetrable defense to an attempt to defend the U.S. ground-based nuclear arsenal."

Then, on 14 January, THE WASHINGTON POST, again citing statements by "U.S. official spokesmen," reported that "a certain group within the administration and the military are stepping up the pressure to examine the limited use of a proportion of the technology developed within the framework of the "star wars" program in the nearer (!) future without waiting for the results of the completed long-term study.... They note that the technological process in individual spheres of this research is advancing more rapidly than many people think."

In particular, according to THE WASHINGTON POST observer (M. Getler), this applies to work to provide an ABM defense system for the Minuteman missile launch silos, future silos for the MX missiles, command centers, and submarine bases.

Finally, on 30 January THE WASHINGTON POST again reported that the Pentagon long ago began to develop this "more prosaic" system with a view to "defending the positions of U.S. strategic missiles."

"This program," the newspaper specified, "has been under way for 18 years (!), only sometimes coming into public view. That is why the United States can create a two-layer defense system...far faster than previously expected."

The explanations and clarifications came thick and fast. W. F. Friedman, appointed by the White House as leader of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, Z. Brzezinski, former adviser to President J. Carter, and scientist W. S. Jostow announced in an article published in late January in the NEW YORK TIMES MAGAZINE that, in addition to ground-launched missiles, preparation is under way to put into orbit 100 large military satellites, each of which will carry 150 interceptor missiles.

"These technical facilities have nothing exotic about them," they write. "We have now carried out several additional scientific studies and experimental design work, we could already (!) create and deploy a two-layer defense."

On 19 February UPI, citing statements by none other than Lieutenant General Abrahamson, told the whole world that "the first test (1987, not "scientific research" - Sm. n.) of space launched ABM technology in space may take place as early as 1987."

On 27 March THE NEW YORK TIMES in turn announced that on instructions from "a private organization," a group of U.S. scientists has prepared a thorough report stating that "by approximately 1989 or perhaps 1988 some of the technologies which are being developed will have been brought to the stage of field testing and deployment experiments."

Speaking in London 13 March, G. F. Wyer, the U.S. President's senior science adviser, made the following clarifying statement in this connection (we quote from the FINANCIAL TIMES): "The concept has emerged of assembling an ABM system from available technology available in the United States...In the summer exercise reported last June, the U.S. Army scored a direct hit on a ballistic missile with a high speed projectile. It was a remarkable demonstration of accurate long range firing in a system assembled from off the shelf technology for only (\$!) 1,900 million."

It remains to be added that on 22 February, after a press conference, the U.S. President himself made it clear that Washington folks are thinking of "research" but of specific plans to deploy space weapons.

#### Document Which Was Not Refuted

Naturally, all this particularly pertains to the "American" plan, with which we had no quarrel. It is well known that the "American" plan is not a plan at all, but a collection of ideas which are working so zealously, it is no wonder that during the debate at the recent Moscow session of the KGB Presidium it was this question which was the focus of attention. Calling for the struggle to be stepped up against the American "Star Wars" plans, those taking part in the debate noted that U.S. military satellites have already drafted plans for using space weapons. In particular, they cited an "official" document of the Pentagon dated 1984, which stated that the U.S. is planning to create a "space-based" defense system.

This document, intended for "internal use," entitled "The U.S. Plan for a Two-Layer Defense," stated that "while U.S. and Soviet representatives are preparing to discuss questions of mutual disarmament, the U.S. Air Force is conducting a policy study on the possibility of creating a two-layer defense system in space."

It is a document on Air Force combat command signed by General Robert E. Ryan, Chief of Staff, and published in 1984 as an "Internal Document."

In particular, it states that space "ensures unlimited potential and opportunities for military operations and somewhere where the Air Force can fulfill or support all its operations and tasks." "The Air Force," the manual continues, "will support U.S. technical superiority in the aerospace field and provide the potential for prolonged military operations by creating the means of conducting combat operations in space."

Of course, the U.S. Air Force command would not have dared to draft this document and hand it out to the troops without the permission of the top leadership.

Final comment. As NEW YORK TIMES observer Philip Boffey stressed in an article published 7 March, specialists working in U.S. Government organs and in industry are now stating openly that space weapons are designed by no means for defense but for the fulfillment of "important OFFENSIVE functions." These weapons, Boffey writes, "can be used as a defensive adjunct to an offensive nuclear strike inasmuch as they will make it possible to launch nuclear missiles while the defense will be in reserve in the event of any retaliatory strike. They can attack and destroy enemy space satellites..."

Moreover, in the opinion of specialists, these weapons "can even be used for lightning strikes from space against relatively poorly defended ground-based targets -- such as aircraft, tankers, power stations, and grain fields -- to that immediate conflagrations and cause damage."

Thus, there is revealed the treacherous deception concerning the alleged "defensive nature" of the space system which it was proposed to create allegedly in the interests of all mankind "to make nuclear war impossible." If some people were taken in by this deception, it is with all the greater vigor that, having realized that they have been misled, they are now joining the struggle against the implementation of the plans set forth so frankly in the U.S. military's handbook.

The task of all those sincerely interested in preventing "hot wars," which would be an inalienable component of an aggressive nuclear war, is to prevent the militarization of space, demanding the precise observance of the Soviet-Leninist record on the subject matter and aim of the present talks in Geneva. During these talks constructive decisions can and must be reached if questions of space and nuclear weapons are discussed in a single package and in an interconnected way.

(SO: 5200/1067

## SPACE ARMS

### OPPOSITION TO SDI WITHIN U.S. NOTED

#### U.S. Internal Criticism

PM181036 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Mar 85 First Edition p 3

[TASS report under the general heading "Space Ambitions"]

[TASS] New York, 25 Mar -- The United States is pushing ahead with the implementation of the dangerous plans for the militarization of space. At Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, installation work is nearing completion on a new launch complex intended for launching space shuttles, which are allotted an important role in the implementation of Reagan's "star wars" program. According to a NEW YORK TIMES report, this complex, whose construction has cost almost \$3 million, will annually launch up to 10 spaceships on Pentagon missions. Furthermore, the newspaper points out, the USAF is building a joint center for space operations in Colorado. The creation of these projects, the NEW YORK TIMES notes, "testifies to the growing militarization of the U.S. space program."

The Reagan administration must renounce the dangerous "star wars" plans and adopt a conciliatory stance at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva. This demand is being urgently made to the White House by eminent scientists and representatives of public organizations. President Reagan's statements on the "need" for a "star wars" program are a downright lie, journalist L. (Kevgan), national coordinator of the public organization "Mobilization to Save Mankind," stated. The implementation of these plans, she noted, would whip up the arms race and mean that the situation would become even more tense and explosive.

The American physicist Wolfgang Panofsky, a professor at Stanford University, California, considers that it is only possible to escape from the present extremely dangerous nuclear confrontation by considerably reducing nuclear arsenals. It is necessary to achieve this, he writes in a letter published in THE NEW YORK TIMES, through talks and not by deploying a large-scale ABM system. The "Strategic Defense Initiative" is an illusion which distracts us from the main goal -- substantial reductions in nuclear arms -- the scientist stresses.

"President Reagan's assertions of the 'moral superiority' of defensive arms over offensive arms are used to mislead the American public regarding the genuine meaning of the 'Strategic Defense Initiative,'" Bernard Davis, professor of bacteriology at Harvard University, writes in a letter to THE NEW YORK TIMES. Can it really be claimed that a shield is morally superior to a spear if it defends a man armed with a spear?

### Sagan, Perle Clash

PM281042 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 85 First Edition p 5

[Article by G. Vasilyev, PRAVDA correspondent: "D-Minus for the Pentagon"]

[Text] Washington, 26 Mar -- When the advocates of the U.S. military-industrial complex find themselves short of arguments during disputes with representatives of antiwar forces, they resort to abuse and threats. This is how Richard Perle, U.S. assistant secretary of defense, acted when he clashed with Carl Sagan, well-known scientist and principled opponent of the arms race, during a joint session of the U.S. House of Representatives subcommittees on natural resources, agriculture, and environmental problems. The question around which the sharp discussion raged was the consequences of nuclear war.

There has been wide reaction in the United States to a report by a group of scientists, including Sagan, who established that in the event of an "exchange of nuclear strikes" the globe, ravaged by destruction, fires, and radiation, will be gripped by "nuclear winter": Clouds of smoke and dust will block off the sun and bring about a sharp fall in temperature, which will threaten all living creatures on our planet with destruction. In an attempt to gloss over the impression made by the scientists' discovery, the Pentagon has published its own counterreport, which raises doubts about the specialists' conclusions. It was precisely from these positions that Perle spoke at the session, advocating the further buildup of arms by the United States as "the way to lasting peace." Sensing that he was losing the argument, the "errant hawk" descended to hurling insults at the astrophysicist.

This did not throw the scientist off his stride, however. In his statement he convincingly proved the untenability and danger of a policy which gives paramount importance to the nuclear arms race. He leveled particularly sharp criticism at the program for so-called "star wars," the plan for the deployment of a large-scale ABM defense system with space-based elements.

"You have to be crazy," Sagan declared, "to make the salvation of the world dependent on this program." "I am highly disturbed by the fact," he went on, "that they (representatives of the U.S. Administration -- G.V.) are trying to push the 'star wars' plans through at all costs." In the scientist's words, all scenarios for nuclear war drawn up in Washington proceed from the premise that the United States is capable of delivering a "first crushing strike." But these plans are suicidal, because a retaliatory strike would inevitably follow, and no "space umbrella" can provide salvation from it. The prospects of "nuclear winter," Sagan pointed out, "require an agonizing review" of military doctrines, including plans for the delivery of first strikes.

As regards the Pentagon report playing down the catastrophic consequences of a "nuclear exchange," Sagan said that if such work had been submitted to him by a student at Cornell University, where he lectures, he would have "graded it straight F, or, if I were in a good mood, D-minus."



### Reagan Rejects Compromise

LD021622 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 2 Apr 85

[Text] The Reagan administration does not intend to abandon its plans to escalate the arms race on earth and extend it into space. Evidence of this is a pronouncement made by President Reagan in an interview with THE WASHINGTON POST. The head of the current Washington administration again advocated a large-scale antimissile defense system, with space-based elements. In an attempt to cover up the extremely dangerous nature of this program, Reagan alleged that it was a research program. He stated that the United States has made progress in carrying out a broad program for the rearmament of America, which, as we know, is aimed at achieving military supremacy over the USSR. In the process, he warned that he would not accept any compromise with Congress over reductions in spending on this program.

### Rep Brown Voices 'Serious Worry'

LD010842 Moscow TASS in English 0829 GMT 1 Apr 85

[Text] Washington April 1 TASS -- U.S. Congressman George Brown (Democrat, California) voiced serious worry over the attempts of the Reagan administration to avoid discussing the "star wars" programme at the Soviet-U.S. Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons. This position, he said in a statement released here, is a grave error because the unwillingness to discuss the "star wars" problem badly subverts prospects for accord.

The lawmaker dismissed the White House's assertions that the programme had an exclusively "research" character. Obviously, he said, the administration is going ahead with the programme which will call for decisions on testing and deployment already in the immediate future. The decision to test components of the system, George Brown stressed, would mean a violation of the 1972 treaty limiting ABM systems, which obliges the sides not to develop, not to test and not to deploy components for systems of underwater-, air-, space- or mobile land-based ABM defences. The Strategic Defence Initiative, the congressman added, encourages competition in offensive weapons.

### Senator Kerry for Test Moratorium

LD040937 Moscow TASS in English 0849 GMT 4 Apr 85

[Text] Washington April 4 TASS -- It is my firm belief that a continued moratorium on the testing of anti-satellite weapons is necessary to promote the continued deterrence of nuclear war, stated Democratic Senator John F. Kerry of Massachusetts.

According to a report of the ASSOCIATED PRESS news agency, the U.S. senator submitted a bill to this effect in Congress on Wednesday. The bill envisages a moratorium on the testing of anti-satellite weapons. A moratorium of this kind which had been earlier adopted by U.S. Congress expired on March 1 -- before the start of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on nuclear and space arms. Giving reasons for his proposal, John Kerry emphasised that the Soviet Union has maintained an anti-satellite weapons testing moratorium since 1982.

It is difficult to say whether the U.S. Congress will support the initiative of the senator from Massachusetts, considering that the Reagan administration has already scheduled a test of anti-satellite weapons for June this year.

9 May 1985

## SPACE ARMS

## U.S. PRESSURE ON ALLIES TO SUPPORT SDI DISCUSSED

Mnatsakanov Commentary

LD302059 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 30 Mar 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; Mnatsakanov talk]

[Text] The United States intends to push ahead with its space militarization program which provides for setting up of a large-scale anti-missile defense system with elements to be based in space. This was confirmed yet again by President Reagan during his speech to the National Space Club in Washington.

Attempting to portray militarization of space as some sort of blessing, Reagan alleged that the crux of the matter here was peace and not war and that should the new military program be a success, a process reverse to that of twisting the spiral of the arms race would take place. In this context, he expressed dissatisfaction that the idea he had put forward had been received by the public as a plan for preparation towards star wars. Over to Eduard Mnatsakanov, political observer.

[Mnatsakanov] Hello, comrades. Reflecting on the activities of his government in the international arena, one of the doyens of American journalists, James Reston, comes to a clear, albeit unpleasant conclusion; in our country, that is to say in the United States of America, he writes in the latest issue of THE NEW YORK TIMES, we have a strategy for war, but we do not have a strategy for peace. If there had been no other advance of Washington's bellicose diplomacy - and James Reston's article is headlined precisely thus - the events of the passing month would have furnished sufficient quantity of such evidence.

Let us recall facts that are universally known. The Soviet-American talks began in Geneva on 12 March, but already 3 days later, on the night between 15 and 16 March, the Pentagon deployed its medium-range nuclear missile weaponry on Belgian territory. Two weeks later, on 26 March, the White House wrestled an agreement from the U.S. Congress to manufacture a new batch of the MX strategic nuclear missiles. On the same day Weinberger, U.S. defense secretary, began in Luxembourg to twist the arms of his colleagues, defense ministers from other NATO countries, having delivered a demand, in ultimatum to the effect that these countries should not only agree to, but also directly participate in the implementation of the American star wars program.

Recently, Weinberger stated that he had managed to persuade his NATO allies to lend unconditional support for Reagan's SDI. However, in my view, he is rather rushing agents: Europeans are not so naive as the military clique from the other side of the

ocean imagines. This is to say nothing of the extensive circles of the Western European public, which begins its traditional spring peace marches under the slogan "Hands off space!" However, even the ruling circles of the NATO countries, do, judging by all appearances, see the shortcomings of both the notorious transatlantic solidarity and the harsh discipline introduced by Washington into this group. News agencies report that the Danish parliament came out against participating in the development of space arms; that the Government has postponed its reply indefinitely; that there is skepticism in Great Britain. In a word, we have a certain amount of resistance, and even confusion.

It is possible that at long last Washington will succeed in overcoming the resistance and confusion and will crush its NATO partners, as has repeatedly happened in the past. But another thing is also certain: West European states are, apparently, aware that being involved in Washington's star adventures is yet another and very serious blow against their own security.

#### Chernyshev Commentary

LD291911 Moscow TASS in English 1841 GMT 29 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow March 29 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev

The United States' Administration is trying hard to persuade its allies to follow Washington's course towards militarizing outer space. Use is made of various "arguments" in favour of the "star wars" concept. In fact, these "arguments" stand up to no criticism. As an example, one can refer to Paul Nitze, adviser to the President and the secretary of state of the U.S., who declared at the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies that a large-scale anti-missile defence system will be deployed in outer space only if its "invulnerability" is proved. Well, allies, don't be afraid. Nothing terrible will happen, but please invest money into "research".

By the way, U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger set a fixed deadline for pondering -- exactly two months.

In itself, the assertion might be capable of comforting someone, although this is hardly the case. Analysing other statements by U.S. officials leaves not a trace of the "comfort". These statements acknowledge that the opposite side will by all means be compelled to adopt countermeasures to penetrate the anti-missile defense and, probably, to destroy its key elements, but the United States, having developed the defence against ballistic missiles, will continue perfecting it, expanding and developing measures against the countermeasures. Thus, Richard Delauer, until recently an under secretary of defence, confessed that the enemy may under any circumstances suppress the U.S. defence when it really wants that. However, he said, there is a counter-countermeasure for every countermeasure.

That is where confusion comes up -- one advocate of "star wars" assures that the system will be deployed only if it proves to be "invulnerable", while the other claims that it will be deployed in any case, but its "invulnerability" will be maintained through constant expansion and perfection of its integral elements.

The conclusion that can be drawn from this example is far more serious. Willy-nilly, Washington officials confirm that the United States is seeking to launch an arms race in a new area -- in outer space, the race that has no end and is extremely costly. They

9 May 1985

suggest "competition" in the spending of license resources to develop an anti-missile defense, penetration means and ever new systems of defending the anti-missile defense system.

The U.S. Administration is stubbornly seeking to bring home to the American people and its allies that security should be strengthened through developing and deploying fundamentally new, ever more dangerous armaments, rather than through holding effective, honest talks that would result in a mutual reduction of nuclear weapons. Indeed, this is the largest deception in the nuclear age, fraught with a danger for all of mankind.

#### U.S. Seeks Research Help

PM291235 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 85 First Edition p 5

[Sergey Vishnevskiy "Commentator's Column": "Pentagon's Ultimatum"]

[Text] Washington has officially called on 17 states -- U.S. military attaches -- to take part in scientific research work within the framework of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" program. It is an unprecedented case in diplomatic practice: such a note has been sent not by the U.S. State Department but...by the Pentagon. And it is not Defense Secretary C. Weinberger presented 13 NATO colleagues, with the exception of Luxembourg for a session of the bloc's Nuclear Planning Group, with the document which reads very much like an ultimatum. In the form of an order, the Pentagon demands: "You will send me within 60 days notification that you are joining the Strategic Defense Initiative research program." Similar ultimatums have also been made on France, Japan, Australia, and Israel (it is still not known who handed them over -- surely not the U.S. military attaches?)

Washington's strong-arm methods vis-a-vis its own allies have been motivated by the strategists' growing irritation with the "disloyal" behavior of the partners who have been in no hurry to demonstrate "unanimous" commitment to the SDI program. The White House recently expressed "extreme indignation" at the public remarks of Foreign Secretary G. Howe, who dared to mention the dangers inherent in the SDI program. The increasing criticism of this program by prominent figures in Western Europe provoked anger on the Potomac. This is why Washington resorted first to the behind-the-scenes arm-twisting and now to the ultimatum.

The flagrant pressure from across the ocean has several aims. The allies are being drawn in scientific research work within the Strategic Defense Initiative program, making them coparticipants in the adventurist program for militarizing space and slowing down the process of nuclear arms limitation and reduction, and would deprive them of the opportunity to promote the success of the Soviet-American talks. In addition, as Weinberger said longingly, "we need all the help we can get" in technological, and financial. In other words, the U.S. military-industrial complex wishes to transfer to its partners a considerable part of the huge burden of militarizing space. According to the sarcastic remarks of the West German Foreign Minister, FRITZ KLAUS VORWAERTS, the U.S. allies are being forced to pay for something which would be an even greater threat to their security. As many Western commentators note, this will result in even greater dependence on the senior partner.

It is obvious that whoever yields to the overseas pressure and joins the SDI program for aggressive space weapons systems will be acting against the basic interests of his own country and will assume the grave responsibility for the pernicious consequences of such actions.

'Frightening Prospect'

1D292106 Moscow TASS (m) 4.5.570 GMT 28 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow March 27 (TASS)—Soviet news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The Reagan Administration is masterminding the West European governments to join in the development of weapons within the framework of the notorious "star wars" program. In order not to deceive the public, the Washington leaders are using as a cover all their plans for a militarization of outer space claims that the point of focus is so far research work rather than production and deployment of such weapons. Some people in Western Europe, in particular, in the commission of the European Communities are pretending that Washington really means research rather than the creation of a first-strike space system. Acting under cover of such "research programs" the commission of the European Communities proposes that the countries of the "Ten" increase their budget appropriations on research work to create "advanced technology" for "star wars."

Western Europe is known to be packed with all types of American nuclear weapons. Now the U.S. administration is out to add to this arsenal also a combat space system. According to the newspaper WASHINGTON POST, the system will include from several hundred to more than 1,000 combat space stations in orbits girdling the earth. Each such station will cost almost a billion dollars will be fitted out with weapons concentrating up to 100,000 watts of energy in a beam...A country having a defence shield, however imperfect it may be, may be tempted to launch the first strike and if this is so, the newspaper NEW YORK TIMES points out in this connection.

It is a very apt remark, that in connection to this end that the U.S. administration is developing its "star wars" program. Within the framework of this program, the role of Western Europe, and in so-called "limited," "small" nuclear wars planned by Washington, will be to serve as a war theatre, a zone designed to be a target for a nuclear strike. Washington is obviously planning to sacrifice Western Europe in the name of its interests.

Two years ago, U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger was quoted by the Canadian TORONTO STAR as saying that the creation of an outer space-based antiballistic missile defence system would be "one of the most frightening prospects one can imagine. Yet today, unfortunately, the U.S. administration advocates the preparation of an outer space-based defence system, the same "frightening prospect." [as received]

Such preparations, whatever they may be called—"research" or "experiments"—remain preparations for the "star wars" for war, threatening the very existence of the population of European countries.



#### V. European Fears Stressed

10/41901 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1940 GMT 27 Mar 85

[from "The World Today" program presented by Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] Europeans--and not only the broad public, but also the ruling circles of the NATO countries of Western Europe--do not want, will not accept, and fear the space adventures of the White House. The transatlantic contradictions are evidently becoming so serious that in the view of the director of Britain's Royal Institute of International Affairs, Admiral James Eberle, this whole dispute could bring about an unprecedented split in NATO.

It is difficult, in a short review, to go into the details of this controversy and describe all the worries and doubts that are rife in Paris, London, and Bonn and in some of the other NATO capitals. But, put briefly, they amount to this: First, European experts and scientists see no real possibility at all of Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative being feasible; it can only lead to an uncontrollable arms race, since the other side, naturally, will not stand by and do nothing. Second, in the capitals of Western Europe there is a fear, and not without reason, that implementation of Reagan's space program will strike a blow at their own security because talk of the possible setting-up of some common space umbrella, intended, allegedly, to protect both the United States and Western Europe, belongs in the realm of absurd phantasy. And, finally, a third point: In Western Europe it is assumed, again not without reason, that Reagan's plans, if they are not renounced, could wreck the Soviet-American disarmament talks -- if anything can derail the Geneva talks, it will be the star wars. East-West relations would, at best, be frozen, and at worst, they could take a sinister form -- so writes the British SUNDAY TELEGRAPH.

Very many people in the countries of Western Europe think likewise. They are sincerely interested not in worsening but in improving relations between East and West, in detente, and in strengthening peace and the security of peoples.

We in the Soviet Union are utterly opposed to allowing the Geneva talks to be turned into a sort of screen, concealing a further speeding up of the arms race. It is quite obvious that if the nuclear arsenals of both sides were frozen, then this would, to a very significant extent, help to solve the whole complex of questions under discussion at Geneva. That is our position, and, as international reactions to Comrade Gorbachev's meeting with the Consultative Council on Disarmament of the European and of the whole international public.

#### NATO Nuclear Group's Support

1028160 Moscow TASS in Russian 1918 GMT 28 Mar 85

[Text] (Moscow) March 28 TASS--Correspondent Albert Balebanov reports:

By reporting the strong opposition, the United States gained to give approval of a resolution of the Security Council on the U.S. plan of preparations for "Star Wars."

This is the main outcome of the two-day session of NATO's Nuclear Planning Group held here. It was attended by defense ministers of 13 NATO member-countries (with the exception of France and Iceland), and Spain had sent its observers.

The final communique of the session directly expresses support for the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" that, in the words of the document, meets NATO security interests, and welcomes Washington's invitation to its Western European partners to take part in its realization.

The United States has sent out such an invitation in order to draw its NATO allies deeper into implementing Washington's arms buildup plans and to dissipate doubts in Western Europe over yet another militarist program with the help of lavish promises including promises of lucrative multimillion orders. However, judging from the communique, Greece expressed disagreement with the U.S. plans, and Spain decided not to commit itself so far.

Against the background of militarist calls the session discussed progress of the deployment of U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles in a number of Western European countries, especially in the light of Belgium's decision to yield to U.S. and NATO pressure and agree to the siting of 16 cruise missiles on its territory. The session stressed the determination to carry on with the deployment of Pershing II and cruise missiles in Western Europe, despite mounting public protests. Greece and Denmark refused to sign corresponding sections of the communique. The session also agreed to take other measures to build up nuclear and conventional weapon capabilities.

Bogachev Comment

LD282132 Moscow TASS in English 2025 GMT 28 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow March 28 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

The Nuclear Planning Group, comprising NATO defence ministers, bowing to Washington's pressure, has approved the implementation of the first stage of the American plan for preparing "star wars". The NATO members announced at their session in Luxembourg the readiness to consider the question of their countries' participation in the Pentagon's project.

The U.S. defence secretary, apparently sparing the self-esteem of some leaders of the European NATO countries who only recently expressed serious fears in connection with the American plans to deploy a large-scale anti-missile defence system, gave them sixty days to consider the matter.

Although the session's final communique, taking into account world public opinion, does mention terms of the ABM Treaty, the talks in Geneva and close consultations between the United States and its allies, the point at issue is, in effect, a U.S. ultimatum. The demand is that NATO members take part in research linked with the "Strategic Defence Initiative."

They in Washington have persistently claimed of late that the United States adopts a fundamentally new military strategy, transferring emphasis from offensive to defensive armaments and replacing the concept of "mutually guaranteed destruction" with that of "mutual survival". At that, U.S. Administration officials prefer not to link the plans for preparing "star wars" with the old American strategy of "limited" nuclear war in Europe. Ronald Reagan's "new formula" rests on the same U.S. directive of preparing for nuclear war that would be waged far from American coasts and ensuring relative safety for the aggressor from a retaliatory strike.

The "star wars" plan ensues from the requirements of the Pentagon concept of "limited" nuclear war.

The anti-missile shield is for the aggressor, the "limited" nuclear war is for Europe. Such is the meaning of the "evolution" of the Pentagon's strategic directives. What is new is that "acceptability" and even "advisability" of U.S. nuclear adventures in Europe should now be substantiated by the illusion of the aggressor's invulnerability behind the large-scale anti-missile defences.

By making the first step towards involvement in implementing the American "star wars" plans, the leaders of Western European NATO countries are embarking on a dangerous path leading to the destabilization of the military-political situation in the world.

#### PRAVDA Review 31 March

PMO21337 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Mar 85 First Edition p 4

[Article by Vladimir Mikhaylov: "International Review"]

[Excerpt] There Are Signals and Signals

In Washington the Socialist International Consultative Council on Disarmament was not received by the U.S. President. A HELSINKI SANOMAT correspondent reported that he was "very busy persuading the members of the House of Representatives to allocate appropriations for MX missiles." They had no time for disarmament problems and the Consultative Council's demands "to halt the development of both defensive and offensive systems, including space weapons, and to halt the deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe."

Getting Congress to cough up money for military concerns for the production of another 21 MX missiles was no easy matter. All the sophisticated methods of "manipulation," even down to threats to deprive the districts they represent of state subsidies, were used against the congressmen who oppose MX. But nearly 50 percent of the House of Representatives was against the buildup of the strategic potential. Why? Well, because it is hard to ignore the people's growing desire to replace the fragile world of military confrontation with the world of equal international cooperation which was tested and proven in the seventies.

#### "Star Wars" and West Europe

"America doesn't need MX" -- this brief formula, uttered by Speaker of the House of Representatives T. O'Neill and backed up by the votes of nearly 50 percent of Congress, apparently explains why the advocates of an excessive arms buildup are pulling out all stops. They are in a hurry because they are frightened lest the resistance in the country and abroad reach the level where the implementation of these plans will be impossible.

The point is that the NATO allies' opposition has become stiffer of late. "The phase of tactical restraint in dialogue within the alliance is now past," the FINANCIAL TIMES noted.

The detailed criticism of the "star wars" program by British Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary G. Howe, which Washington brushed aside at first, began to acquire so much



were prepared to join in the "star wars" preparations. The chief advocates of space militarization -- U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger and General Abrahamson, leader of the "research" into space weapons -- visited the besieged countries' camp. Did they surrender?

No, if none of them has said yes. Australia rejected the suggestion out of hand. Japan "expressed understanding" with regard to the "research work" in the United States, but, the foreign minister said, "neither more, nor less than that." The West European capitals are finding it hard to conceal their annoyance -- they did not expect such unceremonious treatment. Even the faithful U.S. "armor bearers" in Bonn displayed obstinacy -- they refused to recognize the 60 day period and said that they "would welcome the kind of development whereby the Soviet-American talks in Geneva prevented the arms race in space and stopped it on earth." Two states -- NATO members Greece and Denmark -- have already adopted a negative stance on the ultimatum-style proposal.

So they failed to overrun the allies. Washington is relying on the "attractiveness" of its military orders. The allies' involvement in space militarization, the Pentagon believes, will go a long way toward forming a global Western military-industrial complex. It will be the kind of force capable of imposing on individual countries' governments a course away from international disarmament toward an unbridled arms buildup. It cannot be said, however, that the Western world is prepared to become the feeble vassal of a transatlantic sovereign. Japan and Europe, unlike the United States, have had first-hand experience of war and have not forgotten in 40 years what the consequences are of faith in strength and in a "wonder weapon."

#### 'Space Noose' for Allies

PMU/1119 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA In Revue 11 Mar 85 Second Edition p. 1

["International Notes" by Captain Third Rank V. Kuzari: "Space Noose for West Europe"]

[Text] This week a session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group has been held in Luxembourg. Taking part in it were defense ministers and chiefs of general staff of the bloc countries (excluding France and Iceland). The session advocated the further buildup of the nuclear first-strike potential in West Europe and also the modernization of tactical nuclear weapons.

The most important issue at the session was indisputably the discussion of the attitude of the European NATO states to the U.S. "star wars" program. As recent events show, Washington does not intend to abandon the efforts to secure military superiority over the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, nor does it regard these programs as a means of achieving this end. In the desire to rally the bloc partner's support in implementing these programs, the White House has mounted an unprecedented campaign of persuasion. Addressing the session, the Pentagon Secretary of State proposed that the NATO countries, as well as Japan, Australia, and Israel, take part in the militarization of space. To this end they are to determine for themselves within 60 days the most advantageous spheres of interest and then discuss them with the United States on a bilateral basis.

It was immediately clear that this proposition was rejected. The session participants, including the Greek and Spanish representatives, voted in support of the U.S. "strategic defense initiative." It is true that they still tried to put a brave face on things, calling the U.S. program a "research project" and a "purely research nature." But,



after all, you do not load guns just to see how the cartridge fits into the barrel. THE SUNDAY TIMES is right when it wrote that "the actual onward movement of the interested industrial circles and technological progress will spur things on to the transfer of these plans from the drawing board into space."

Tempted by U.S. handouts, the Atlanticists are pushing West Europe into Washington's "space noose." After all, it is no secret that, by resorting to scientific, technological, and financial assistance from its allies, the United States is counting on transferring to them part of the burden of spending on militarizing space, and, what is more, undermining the economies of its main competitors and drawing them into its economic bondage. Something else is obvious, too. Involving the West European NATO countries in the "Strategic Defense Initiative" makes them direct participants in the process of undermining the military-strategic balance between East and West and further aggravating the international situation. Finally, this kind of ultimatum presented to the allies and the minimum "time for thought" have demonstrated yet again Washington's unceremonious attitude to its junior partners. There is no doubt that, in the interests of U.S. imperialism, the current U.S. Administration is always ready to tighten the noose the heads of the military departments are currently throwing over their own countries.

The following fact also causes alarm. The approval of the "star wars" program by one of the leading NATO military organs is evidence that the Pentagon's plans for militarizing space are gradually becoming NATO plans. Realizing all the danger of this turn of events, the progressive public of the West European countries is stepping up the struggle against transferring the arms race to space. Thus, the Danish Folketing (parliament) has approved a resolution which compels the country's government to condemn the aggressive U.S. plans. Opposition to Washington's "Strategic Defense Initiative" is growing in France. Dumas, the French external relations minister, recently announced that the use of space according to U.S. plans essentially means excessive armament and entails increased risk and danger.

There is no doubt that the decisions of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group session, adopted under U.S. pressure, pose an additional threat to the cause of world peace, and primarily to the security of the peoples of West Europe.

#### Weinberger Visits France

LD281427 Moscow TASS in English 2247 GMT 27 Mar 85

[Text] Paris March 27 TASS -- U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger has arrived here for a three-day official visit at the invitation of Charles Hernu, French minister of defence.

Today he will be received by President Francois Mitterrand of France and will meet with Defense Minister Charles Hernu and Roland Dumas, minister for external relations.

Weinberger's visit to France is part of his European tour during which Washington intends by way of pressure on West European countries to secure West European allies' accession to the U.S. "star wars" plans. When discussing the question of bilateral cooperation in the field of conventional arms, the head of the Pentagon is expected to insist on the acquisition of U.S. "AWACS" radar planes for France. Their cost is to be partly compensated by a U.S. purchase of the French automated communications system "RTTA".

9 May 1985

## French Resistance Noted

PM031211 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Apr 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by Yu. Kovalenko, IZVESTIYA correspondent: "Visit by 'Traveling Salesman' for 'Star Wars'"]

[Text] Paris -- The 4-day visit to France by U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger has ended. During it, he held talks with President F. Mitterrand and Defense Minister C. Hernu and visited a number of military installations, including the Plateau d'Albion, where the French nuclear forces are located.

The main aim of the visit by the U.S. military department chief was to persuade Paris to participate in U.S. plans to militarize space. C. Weinberger handed C. Hernu a letter containing an "invitation" to France to join the "star wars" preparation program (a similar letter was addressed to all NATO countries, and also Japan, Australia, and Israel by the Pentagon boss).

Judging by the latest statements by officials and press reaction, Paris has a good idea of the great danger attendant on preparations for "star wars," is voicing concern at Washington's militarist preparations, and does not intend to yield to the overseas pressure. France believes, French External Relations Minister R. Dumas said at a press conference in Helsinki, that the balance of offensive forces that exists in the world guarantees security. As for Washington's "Strategic Defense Initiative," R. Dumas stressed, this plan would lead to excessive armament, which is what the militarization of space would be, and consequently to "heightened risk and danger."

Commenting on the U.S. defense secretary's visit, Paris LIBERATION stresses that, in seeking the participation of France and other West European countries in its space programs, Washington wants to deprive them completely of their independence in military matters. The Pentagon's plans, the paper notes, put France in a dangerous position. French people are worried that the "star wars" programs will be a destabilizing factor for peace in Europe.

In connection with C. Weinberger's talks in France, it is being stressed that, while spreading the arms race to space, the United States does not intend to upset its plans for building up earth-based strategic first-strike forces.

There is another fact to which observers are drawing attention. At the same time as the U.S. defense secretary was in France, EEC Commission Chairman J. Delors was announcing that he would propose that the EEC increase the community budget for conducting research connected with the militarization of space. Delors bears a grave responsibility, L'HUMANITE writes, for extending the EEC's sphere of competence to the military sphere. Now, the European framework of the EEC and the North Atlantic bloc almost completely coincide, observers say, following the adoption of the decision on Spain and Portugal's entry into the Common Market.

The visit to France by the "traveling salesman" for "star wars" -- this is what L'HUMANITE called Weinberger -- attests that the United States, while continuing to deploy its cruise and Pershing missiles in West Europe, is at the same time intensifying its efforts to "twist the arm" of its allies in an attempt to make them emulate the Pentagon's quest for militarizing space.

## U.S. Pressures France, Spain

PM020822 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Apr 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS reports under the general headline "Peace for Our Planet Protesting the 'Star Wars' Program; Washington Striving To Involve Allies in Militarization of Space"]

[Excerpt] Washington, 31 Mar--The Reagan administration is stubbornly trying to involve its West European allies in the implementation of the dangerous plans for the militarization of space. U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger, returning from a European tour during which he took part in a session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group and visited Paris, admitted in conversation with journalists that U.S. allies are continuing to voice fears over the "star wars" program.

Paris, 31 Mar--Washington is exerting undisguised pressure on France in an attempt to obtain its involvement in Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative."

According to a report in LE MONDE newspaper, during his visit to Paris U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger handed French Defense Minister C. Hernu a letter containing proposals for France to participate in the scientific research work being conducted in the United States in the sphere of the creation of space weapons. Washington adds that certain other U.S. NATO allies and Israel, Japan and Australia have been taking part in the work too.

However, France, judging by press publications, is for the time being in no hurry to submit to U.S. pressure. Washington is having difficulty in persuading Paris to join in research on the preparation of military space programs, the newspaper LA CROIX points out.

Madrid, 31 Mar--P. Nitze, consultant to the U.S. President and the secretary of state on arms control talks, who was visiting the Spanish capital, proposed to Spanish Premier F. Gonzalez that Spain participate in U.S. "technological programs" in return for support for the "star wars" program put forward by President Reagan. Washington, the Madrid newspaper DIARIO 16 writes, would like to obtain the Spanish Government's support on this question before R. Reagan's official visit to Madrid scheduled for the start of May. Until now the Spanish Government has not officially expressed its position on "star wars."

## FRG Agrees To Participate

LD011448 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 1 Apr 85

[Text] Woerner, minister of defense of the Federal Republic of Germany, is holding talks in Washington today with U.S. Vice President Bush, and with Weinberger, the Pentagon chief. Here is an up-to-date news commentary. At the microphone is our political observer Aleksandr Zholkver:

[Zholkver] Both the American and the West German press are unanimously pointing out that the issue of FRG participation in American space weapons development is at the center of the current Washington talks of the head of the Bonn war department. As is known, this issue was placed before all NATO members by Weinberger

9 May 1985

at the recent session of the Nuclear Planning Group in Luxembourg. Judging by reports carried by the news agencies, however, Washington's call, although clearly meant to be an ultimatum, did not produce any particular enthusiasm even among the United State's closest allies. The British, the French, and even the West German Governments stated that they needed to think about it more. Denmark and Australia, for their part, declared outright that they will not take part in the American program of preparations for star wars. Under these conditions Washington took special measures to intensify pressure upon Bonn, which is usually seen as top pupil in the Atlantic class. General Abrahamson, head of the American military space program, was sent urgently to the West German war department and a number of other FRG ministries. At the same time Woerner, the Bonn defense minister, was invited to the United States. Addressing a meeting of American and West German politicians in Dallas, he announced that the FRG Government agrees to participate in implementing the Washington administration's plans for developing space weapons.

This statement caused a commotion even among experienced Bonn officials. Since when have statements on the most important issues been made not by the government, but by just one of its ministers? What's more, it was made not in its own capital, but on a visit? The fact of the matter is that certain circles in West Germany, whose interests are expressed by Woerner, really would like to become involved in major American military programs. The FRG military-industrial complex is counting on getting both additional profits and additional influence within NATO from this.

At the same time, many prominent West German politicians, including some of those present at the Dallas meeting, have warned sufficiently openly of the fact that FRG participation in the American star wars plans would have disastrous consequences for thickly-populated West Germany. I have to say that really none of this is an April Fools' Day joke.

#### Schmidt Criticism Cited

LD261548 Moscow TASS in English 1102 GMT 26 Mar 85

[Text] Bonn March 26 TASS--The development of space weapons by the USA could lead to a fresh escalation of international tension, former West German Federal Chancellor Helmut Schmidt stated. Talking to British scientists and politicians in London, where he is on a visit, Helmut Schmidt pointed out the need for European countries to produce joint political initiatives to block their participation in the American plans to militarise space, the DPA news agency reports.

#### Anatoliy Gromyko on Dutch Attitude

LD030501 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1550 GMT 2 Apr 85

[From the "Novosti" program]

[Text] A discussion meeting between mass information media representatives has taken place in the Netherlands.

[Begin video recording] [reporter K. Mazheyka -- identified by screen caption] What must be done so that the mass information media can facilitate the growth of trust between peoples? A discussion has been going on about this for 3 days within the walls of Van [as heard] Alerdinck Castle. The bases of the peace-loving Soviet foreign policy were expounded in the addresses of Anatoliy Andreyevich Gromyko, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Vladimir Borisovich Lomeyko, publicist and international expert. After the meeting, we invited them to the microphone.

[Mazheyka] How do the Dutch, in your opinion, regard Washington's plans to spread the arms race into space?

[A.A. Gromyko -- identified by screen caption] I would say that, of course, under the influence of NATO propaganda, it must not be thought that all Dutch people have a clear perception of the aggressive character of these plans, but in our discussions, I must say, we felt that the longer it goes on, the more that Dutch scientists, social figures, representatives of the press understand that these are not defensive plans. They understand that these are aggressive plans, that if the arms race spills out into space the cause of peace will suffer and arms will begin to creep over the whole globe. This simply must not be allowed. [end recording]

#### Japan Studying Participation

LD300357 Moscow TASS in English 0729 GMT 29 Mar 85

[Text] Tokyo March 29 TASS--The Government of Japan has received an official message from U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger inviting it to join in the program of preparations for "star wars," Japan's Foreign Minister Shitaro Abe has disclosed in parliament.

According to the foreign minister, the message requests that the answer be given within 60 days. Japanese ministries and departments have begun to study that issue feverishly. However, as the newspaper YOMIURI stresses today, "positively" to the Reagan administration's proposal to take part in outer space militarization. [as received] Earlier Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone expressed readiness to make the newest Japanese technology available to the United States for the development of space weapons.

CSO: 5200/1071



## SPACE ARMS

### FURTHER COVERAGE OF ALLIED REACTIONS TO SDI PROPOSAL

#### Carrington Voices Fears

LD032331 Moscow TASS in English 2253 GMT 3 Apr 85

[Text] Washington April 4 TASS--There are serious fears in Western European countries of the U.S. "star wars" project. The fact has been indirectly admitted by NATO Secretary-General Lord Carrington.

Talking with journalists after his White House meeting with President Reagan devoted specially to the project, he bluntly declared that the Strategic Defense Initiative is becoming a target of criticism. The ASSOCIATED PRESS recalls in this connection that the governments of several American allies voiced concern over the fact that the implementation of the programme will result in an arms race in outer space.

#### West European Concern

LD052247 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1910 GMT 5 Apr 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] Now I shall give you two quotations, about the threat of the militarization of space, and you try and guess who said each of them. Quote No 1: The creation of a system of antimissile defense with space-based elements would be one of the most threatening prospects I can conceive of. Quote No 2: If such a system is deployed the probability of nuclear war will increase many times over. Sensible opinions, of course, but what's interesting is that the author of the first quotation is the Pentagon boss Weinberger, of the second the White House. The point is that these statements were made a couple of years ago. At that time, the White House and Weinberger were speaking about what might happen if the notorious system of space defense were deployed by...the Russians, the Soviet Union.

However, it was not we who set about doing this, but the United States, and so a striking conversion came about. Now, according to the White House's assurances, a system of star wars not only does not increase many times over the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, but, on the contrary, it reliably ensures peace, security, and disarmament.

In Western capitals these days one frequently hears hypocritical sighs about how very understandable the USSR's concern is as regards the U.S. space programs.

In this connection the words of Alessandro Natta, general secretary of the Italian Communist Party, come to mind. He exclaimed, speaking at a meeting in Genoa: "No, gentlemen, you're on the wrong track. Better express the concern of your own countries, and Europe as a whole!"

The Soviet Union has sufficient material and intellectual resources to respond to any challenge, although, of course, it and its allies are doing everything possible to eliminate the plans for the militarization of space and to avert a new dangerous spiral in the arms race. But what is the response to these plans in West Europe? Are they aware there of the whole ominous character of the plans and the great responsibility that will rest on those who support them? It is quite impossible to give a simple answer to these questions at the moment. According to reports, the agonizing process of working out their positions is now going on in the West European countries of NATO.

As is known, Weinberger has invited other NATO countries, and also some states not in NATO, such as Japan, to take part in carrying out the first stage of the militarization of space, which goes under the name of scientific research work. A deadline has been given for a definitive answer to this ultimatum-like invitation: 2 months. So far, not one country has officially replied to this. In Paris, London, and Bonn, there are endless discussions bringing up many questions. The most sober-minded politicians of the West European countries cannot but ponder the question of what on earth will happen to the security of these countries if the Pentagon's space designs are realized, or of whether joining the Pentagon's scientific research will not lead to an unrestrained drain on the newest technology, not to mention a brain drain from West Europe to America. Of course, every sensible person understands that the American venture can only very seriously complicate the already complicated talks between the USSR and the United States in Geneva.

There is a vast fund of doubts, fears, disagreements, and questions, but so far there are no answers to them. Answers are expected from the U.S. President when he comes to West Europe at the beginning of May, but many people do not expect that there will be much to rejoice at from this meeting either. However weighty the Europeans' considerations and objections might be, the British SUNDAY TELEGRAPH writes, they will not make the slightest impression on the American President.

#### Israel Planning To Participate

LD081235 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 8 Apr 85

[Commentary by Igor Charikov]

[Text] According to UPI, Israel intends to participate in preparations for the implementation of the star wars program. Igor Charikov comments on this report:

It is known that Defense Secretary Weinberger sent messages to the governments of 17 leading U.S. allies on 26 March proposing that they take part in working out and subsequently implementing the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI]. Hiding behind this seemingly harmless term are Washington politicians' plans for the militarization of space. Among the message's 17 addressees was Israel.

It is not surprising that the United States has chosen Israel as one of the closest assistants in the preparations for the star wars. You see, Israel has been, and

as U.S. Administration leaders confirm, will remain for a long time in the future, a strategic ally of the United States. This alliance manifests itself in Israel's assumption of essentially the role of a guard of U.S. imperialism's interests in the Near East and a role of a striking fist in the implementation of its regional policy.

The United States spares no means for the Israeli militarists' armaments and hands over the latest types of weapons and intelligence data gathering from satellites and so on under any pretext. From this point of view, Israel's participation in the program to prepare for star wars can be viewed as a cause for even closer military-strategic cooperation.

Tel Aviv did not ponder very long about its reply: It immediately understood the broad possibilities participation in this further U.S. militarist venture has for Israeli militarists. There is first of all the possibility of receiving additional subsidies. The volume of U.S. military aid to Israel grows annually even without this. If it represented \$1.2 billion in the last fiscal year, the administration is now asking for \$1.8 billion from Congress in next year's draft budget. All together, as specialists have calculated, the United States has paid Israel more than \$30 billion in the 1948-1980 period, two-thirds of which has been used for the Israeli Army's armaments.

It is quite obvious that while drawing Israel into its star wars program, Reagan's administration is pursuing a twofold objective; specifically, to distribute the responsibility for the new round of the arms race, the militarization of space, among its allies, and to tie Israel even more strongly to its military machine.

#### Israeli Opposition Statement

LD082143 Moscow TASS in English 1822 GMT 8 Apr 85

[Text] Rome April 8 TASS -- Israel's Democratic Front for Peace and Equality protested against the aggressive "star wars" program and recorded opposition to the participation of Israel in its implementation. A statement circulated by the organization here stresses that Washington's dangerous plans constitute a threat to peace and the very existence of the human race. The front, the leading force of which is the Communist Party of Israel, called for turning down the official proposal of the White House on Israel's participation in research within the framework of the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative".

CSO: 5200/1091

SPACE ARMS

FURTHER COMMENTARIES VIEW SDI, GENEVA TALKS

SDI Contradicts Talks Agreement

PM191151 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Mar 85 Second Edition p 4

[Tomas Kolesnichenko "International Review"]

[Excerpts] Heads of state and government from the majority of foreign countries and many party and public figures gathered this week in Moscow in connection with K.U. Chernenko's death. Their arrival testifies to the CPSU's high international prestige and the USSR's enormous influence in today's world. The meetings held over the last few days between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and other Soviet leaders with representatives of socialist, capitalist, and developing countries confirmed the broad opportunities for constructive work for the benefit of strengthening peace and international security. Further evidence of this was also provided by the Soviet-French talks in Moscow.

Our course in the foreign policy sphere is clear and consistent. It is a course of peace and progress. The world press notes in particular that the course of the Soviet Union's foreign policy is free of the lurches and zigzags often displayed in the policy of capitalist states during leadership changes. The CPSU Central Committee extraordinary plenum confirmed the continuity of the strategic line elaborated by our party's 26th congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums. It has been and remains unchangeable.

Goodwill Is Needed

The world public's attention has focused on the speeches by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee at the party Central Committee extraordinary plenum and the Red Square funeral meeting. Excerpts from these speeches were front-paged by the foreign press. They were broadcast on all television channels in the world. Special attention was given to the declaration that "we proceed from the premise that the right to live under conditions of peace and freedom is the main human right. We reaffirm our readiness to maintain good-neighborly relations with all countries on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence and on the basis of equality and mutually advantageous cooperation.

Not a single political observer failed to single out the belief, expressed at the CPSU Central Committee plenum, that when a terrible threat is hanging over mankind, the only reasonable way out of the prevailing situation is an agreement between the opposing

forces on immediate cessation of the arms race -- primarily the nuclear arms race -- on earth and its prevention in space. The world's major newspapers noted the high appraisal of the successes achieved in easing international tension in the seventies and the expression of Soviet readiness to participate in the continuation of the process of establishing peaceful and mutually advantageous cooperation among states. West Germany's SÜDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG writes: "The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee declared that the Soviet Union is not striving to gain unilateral advantages over the United States or the NATO countries or to attain military superiority over them. The USSR wishes an end to, and not a continuation of, the arms race and therefore proposes a freeze on nuclear arsenals and the cessation of further missile deployment." The great topicality of this appeal has been proved yet again by the massive wave of protest against the deployment of U.S. first-strike missiles in Europe which has swept through Belgium and other countries on the continent in recent days.

Talks between the Soviet Union and the United States have begun in Geneva. Our approach toward these talks is well known. It was authoritatively reaffirmed in Moscow that we desire a real and major reduction of stockpiled weapons and not the creation of increasingly new weapons systems, whether in space or on earth.

And how about the United States? Does the U.S. side intend to honor all points of the agreement between the USSR and the United States on the issue of the subject and objective of the talks, elaborated during the 7-8 January meeting in Geneva? This question is by no means rhetorical. U.S. news agencies report that the delegations in Geneva have agreed on strict confidentiality in their work. It is, nevertheless, in the U.S. press that news reports are being "leaked," and these reports cannot but put the international public on guard. Actually, these reports are not news, but rather echoes of public statements made by official spokesmen of the U.S. Administration on the eve of the Geneva talks and, to all appearances, they reflect the U.S. stance on these talks. This, incidentally, was actually confirmed by U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz, who declared a few days ago that the United States has no intention of giving up its "star wars" program during the Geneva talks, but is only prepared to...conduct a "more extensive dialogue" on this question. Such declarations can hardly help create a propitious atmosphere at the talks. After all, all these deliberations are nothing but an attempt to justify the U.S. plans to militarize space which, if implemented, would inevitably lead to a new acceleration of the arms race, a dangerous disturbance of strategic stability, and an increased threat of nuclear war.

Under pressure from critics both inside the United States and far beyond its borders, the "star wars" program is being correspondingly modified and given a propaganda gloss in an attempt to present it as increasingly innocuous and attractive. Stress has recently been laid on the so-called "research" aspect of the problem. After all, people in Washington claim, what is so reprehensible about scientists conducting scientific research to develop an ABM "shield?" So far, not a single word has been said about deploying space weapons. So far -- precisely! "Research" work in the sphere of the militarization of space is only the first real step along the path of developing new and previously unknown types of weapons, a most important element in the process of the development of a large-scale ABM system by the Pentagon. This system has been planned as a means of attaining military superiority and of advancing of Washington to global first-strike positions. This was confirmed a few days ago before a Senate committee by General Abrahamson, leader of the organization charged with implementing the "strategic defense initiative."



Attempting to push through a further increase in appropriations for Reagan's "star wars," the general claimed that "the emphasis of the program is on the development of non-nuclear defense weapons." Actually it is a desire to deliver a first nuclear strike with impunity, from beneath a space "shield." It is completely clear that the development of an ABM system with space-based elements would cancel out the Soviet-U.S. limitation treaty on the limitation of ABM systems. Abrahamson himself was forced to admit this. Answering a question by Senator J. Glenn as to whether the deployment of such a system would be in violation of the treaty, the general declared with a soldier's frankness: "I think the answer would be an unqualified yes."

A closer investigation shows that the "scientific" research, which appears "innocuous" at first glance, is fraught with tragic consequences. This is especially so if American society's mentality is taken into account. By investing billions in such "research" today, present-day militarists in the United States want as it were to pass on their work to the next generation, to consolidate the arms race course well into the 21st century, and to obtain some kind of guarantee that the hands of future U.S. leaders will be tied and unable to retreat from the present militarist course.

Even M. Kampelman, leader of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks, makes no secret of the fact that "research" is not too far removed from actual weapons. A recently published article, co-authored by him with the well-known Z. Brzezinski and Professor of Physics R. Jastrow, contains a specific appeal for the deployment of ABM weapons in space as early as the early nineties.

The authors furthermore believe that the first stage of building the ABM layer in space would require no fewer than 100 combat stations and armed artificial satellites for which \$43 billion would be necessary.

And another thing: No one has been misled by all the attempts by official Washington to present the "research" work on developing an all-encompassing ABM system as an abstract flight of scientific thought. Here, for example, according to the LOS ANGELES TIMES, is how Sidney Drell, well-known physicist from Stanford University, reacted when asked why the "research" on developing an ABM system should not be compared with the landing of men on the moon. S. Drell's answer is as follows: "The moon did not resist." "The Russians, on the other hand," the newspaper explains, "would start resisting by developing sufficient new missiles to overpower the space-based defense system." In other words, any U.S. "space-based defense" plans will lead to a qualitatively new spiral of the arms race.

It goes without saying that all this directly contradicts the objectives the elaboration of effective agreements aimed precisely at preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on earth and limiting and reducing nuclear arms. This is why the Soviet Union's recent call to reach agreement on an honest and equal basis without attempting to "outplay" the other side and impose one's own conditions on it, an agreement which would help everyone progress toward the desired goal--the total destruction and prohibition of nuclear weapons forever--is so topical.

Only such an approach can lead to success at the Geneva talks. The Soviet Union will always respond to goodwill with goodwill and to trust with trust. But everyone must know that we will never compromise the interests of our motherland and its allies.

Brochure on SDI Critiqued

PM211343 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 85 First Edition p 4

[Article by G. Vasilyev, PRAVDA correspondent: "Space Debates in the United States; Administration's Arguments Under Critical Fire"]

[Text] Washington, March--The start of the new Soviet-U.S. talks encompassing a package of nuclear and space armaments has generated widespread responses in the United States. Sane Americans have seen a good omen in it. They believe that the talks may pave the way to the attainment of mutually acceptable and equitable accords which would halt or even better reverse man's slide toward the nuclear abyss. At the same time, the apologists of the "from a position of strength" policy, the opponents of peaceful coexistence, are displeased and worried. They are afraid that measures aimed at preventing the arms race in space and halting it on earth could hamper their efforts aimed at reaching a goal which is constantly slipping away from them--the acquisition of military superiority over the socialist countries.

The discussions which have flared up in recent weeks in U.S. newspapers, scientific conference halls, and congressional committees advance to the fore a problem of key importance for making headway at the talks--the problem of the prevention of the militarization of space.

In an attempt to reassure the public alarmed by the "star wars" program, leading figures in the U.S. administration are defending these plans almost daily. As though they were following a crib sheet, they are pouring forth identical arguments designed to mislead people. The arguments' uniformity is no accident. A "crib" does exist. It is the special brochure "The President's Strategic Defense Initiative" issued recently by the White House. Let's take a look at the brochure's theses, because what this slim 10-page volume contains is a kind of quintessence of the propaganda "wisdom" of those who try to make out that black is white and to present the mortally dangerous plans to saturate space with sophisticated types of armaments as "the path leading to peace and security."

The brochure's first fraudulent assertion: The wide-ranging ABM system which the United States is preparing to deploy is presented as "defensive," making it possible to shift the emphasis from nuclear offensive armaments to defensive armaments.

The second fraudulent assertion: The creation of an all-embracing ABM system with space-based elements will strengthen stability and international security.

The third: The implementation of "the President's Strategic Defense Initiative" will "promote a substantial reduction in and ultimately the elimination of ballistic missiles and the nuclear charges they carry."

The fourth: The implementation of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" is being undertaken exclusively within the framework of scientific research and experimental design work and therefore "does not contradict" U.S. treaty commitments, including the current Soviet-U.S. treaty on the limitation of ABM systems.

And, finally, the fifth assertion: Having set itself the aim of militarizing near-earth space, the United States is "not seeking" to achieve military and political superiority, but is merely concerned "to reduce the threat of nuclear war."

All these assertions, like the White House brochure's other "revelations," are sheer lies, a collection of tricks, and simply false arguments designed to mislead simpletons. But however complex the convolutions of the military strategic issues connected with the militarization of space may seem to the ordinary person, there are many people in the United States with a good understanding of the subject. The voices of these people--eminent scientists, retired generals and admirals, and well-known politicians--are being heard increasingly loudly in the country today.

Let's hear what they have to say about the White House "crib's" theses. Let's begin at the end, with the "peaceloving" intentions of the champions of "star wars," and their alleged lack of desire for military superiority. However strange it may seem, it is the "hawks" themselves who come to the aid of those who would like to find out the truth here. The point is that among themselves at business conferences, the militarists speak quite differently from the way they do in public--they don't beat about the bush.

For instance, here is what U.S. Air Force General Robert Marsh said some time ago: "We must achieve the ability to wage war from the surface of the earth against targets in space and from space-based installations against other installations in space, and from space against the earth." His boss, Edward Aldridge, undersecretary of the Air Force, explained the strategic and political goals which the U.S. plan to militarize near-earth space is pursuing: "You don't need to make a particular effort of imagination to see that the nation which controls space can control the whole world."

As for the other arguments in the White House brochure, let's cite the authors of the book "Fallacious Arguments for Star Wars" ["Lozhnyye Dovody V. Zashchitu Zvezdnykh Voyn"]. They include well-known U.S. scientists like Nobel Prize winner nuclear physicist Hans Bethe, physics professor Kurt Gottfried, Henry Kendall, Victor Weisskopf, and Richard Garwin, astronomer Carl Sagan, military strategy specialist Richard (Nel Lebow), chemistry professor Franklin Long, and foreign policy specialist John Steinbruner. Admiral Noel Gayler, retired, and Herbert Scoville, former deputy director of the CIA for science and technology, also took part in the book's creation.

The scientists show that formally "defensive" and allegedly "humane" efforts in actual fact lead to the destabilization of the world situation, to a sharp aggravation of the race in defensive and, especially, in offensive arms, and make the unleashing of nuclear war far likelier.

"The perils (of the 'star wars' plans--G.V.)," the book says, "are decidedly greater than the advantages which could be derived if our technical potential were far greater than now. The U.S. decision to initiate the deployment of ABM defense would give rise to retaliatory steps from the Soviet Union and would generate a chain reaction of actions and counteractions which would radically alter the strategic environment to the detriment of both countries' security."

Although the U.S. administration calls its space plans defensive, the book continues, the USSR "interprets them as offensive, as part of the U.S. efforts aimed at gaining the ability to deliver a first strike against Soviet strategic forces and subsequently take cover from a retaliatory strike." The authors acknowledge that this viewpoint of Soviet specialists is entirely founded inasmuch as plans to prepare for the deployment of ABM "defense" in space are accompanied in the United States by the buildup of first-strike offensive armaments like the MX, Midgetman, and Trident II missiles and Washington's adoption of the doctrine that a nuclear war can be waged and won. It was none other than the U.S. President himself who admitted the rightfulness [pravomer-nost] of this viewpoint when he said in his notorious 23 March 1983 "star wars" speech that the proposed plan to deploy ABM defense in space "if it is combined with offensive systems...can be assessed as a factor promoting an aggressive policy."

The book's authors refute the assertion that the U.S. "star wars" plans, because they are still at the scientific research work stage, do not violate any existing U.S. arms limitation commitments, above all those envisaged by the 1972 Soviet-U.S. ABM systems limitation treaty. It is absolutely obvious that the ABM defense in space conceived by the administration is incompatible with the 1972 ABM treaty, they say. That treaty bans the creation, testing and deployment of a nationwide ABM system which would cover an entire country, irrespective of where that system is located, at sea, in the air, in space, or on mobile ground-based installations.

The discussion of the question of the future of space has recently been advanced to the foreground of foreign policy discussions in Washington. Sensible Americans' fears were intensified when the figures for the U.S. budget for fiscal 1986 were published. They provide for expenditure on plans for preparing for "star wars" to nearly treble (in all, in 5 years it is planned to spend \$26 billion on these aims) and for the simultaneous acceleration of the program to build up offensive armaments. All this could not fail to generate justified distrust in the "peaceloving" phraseology used by the U.S. administration and doubts as to its goodwill with regard to arms limitation.

The materials of the CPSU Central Committee March (1985) Plenum, which noted that the only sensible way out of the existing situation is an agreement by the opposing forces on the immediate cessation of the race in arms, above all nuclear arms, on earth and its prevention in space, were welcomed with enormous attention here. The Soviet Union's confirmation of its course toward a real and large-scale reduction of stockpiled armaments and not toward the creation of ever new weapons systems in space or on earth was welcomed with satisfaction.

The Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva open up opportunities for a serious and fruitful examination of questions of the prevention of the arms race in space and its cessation on earth. The interests of all mankind demand that these opportunities should not be missed.



### 'Delirious Plans'

LD211717 Moscow TASS in English 1641 GMT 21 Mar 85

[Text] Washington March 21 TASS -- Making delirious plans for attaining military superiority, the U.S. military regard the near-earth space as a potential theater for future combat operations. Military uses of outer space have become a major element in the activities of the Pentagon, said Major General Karl Beer, deputy chief of staff of the USAF Space Command. He spoke at hearings in one of the subcommittees of the Armed Services Committee of the U.S. Senate. In his words, the U.S. Space Command had carried out a special study which made plans for space militarization for the period till 2000. It follows from his remarks that the construction of a special center will be completed shortly at Peterson Air Force Base in Colorado which will among other things train operators of U.S. military space systems. The construction of the Joint Center of Space Operations, also based in Colorado, is nearing completion now.

Another high-ranking member of the U.S. Space Command Brigadier General Donald Kutyno stressed during the hearings that the Pentagon regarded reusable spacecraft as the main vehicle for the delivery of military-related cargoes to the orbit. In his words, the first launch of the reusable spacecraft from a new launching complex at Vandenberg Air Force Base is planned for February 1986. Answering the question of Senator Gary Hart if a moratorium on the testing of anti-satellite systems was in line with U.S. interests, General Kutyno said that the United States needed no such moratorium. A comprehensive ban would be an obstacle to all those programs that are now in development, he stressed.

Speaking in one of the subcommittees of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, urged legislators to support President Reagan's "star wars" program.

### U.S. Stance Ignores Accord

LD222038 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1358 GMT 22 Mar 85

[Text] Geneva, 22 Mar (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports:

It is reported from reliable sources that at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons, after a series of plenary sessions the delegations will break up next week into three groups. This was envisaged by the accord reached by the foreign ministers of both countries in January of this year in Geneva. The joint Soviet-U.S. statement stressed that the whole range of questions concerning space and nuclear weapons -- strategic and medium-range -- would be examined and dealt with in mutual interconnection.

Now, however, judging by reports that have percolated from the press, the American delegation is behaving as if no such accord had existed. The principle of the mutual interconnection of the questions to be discussed is being disputed, and there are endless attempts to push to one side the problem of the nonmilitarization of space and declare it to be "artificial" and "non-existent". At the same time official U.S. propaganda continues to advertise widely President Reagan's so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative", by depicting this aggressive doctrine as a "loftily moral," "humane" idea, called upon to guarantee world stability and security. These absurd assertions have been repeated in particular by the U.S. representative at the session of the conference on disarmament taking place here.



Although bilateral negotiations between the USSR and the U.S. delegations are taking place in confidence, it may be surmised that the U.S. side will also use the same approved theses relating to the "research", the "purely defensive" nature of Reagan's doctrine, not reckoning with the fact that in no way do they tally with elementary logic and the known facts.

To a lesser degree, what also looks strange is the fact that, as has become known, the U.S. delegation arrived at Geneva in the mood to curtail the first "procedural" part of the negotiations and set off home for the Easter holidays. It is doubtful whether such "holiday" moods testify to a serious approach and correspond to the aspirations of the international community awaiting very rapid and specific results from the participants.

More than once USSR leaders have stated that the Soviet delegation will carry on a dialogue in an honest and businesslike manner and that the same attitude should be expected from the U.S. side. The U.S. representatives assure that they are of a no less serious disposition. However, the best proof of sincerity at the negotiations is the rough observation of the letter and the spirit of the January accord. Here the words and the deeds of the U.S. side, judging by everything, agree badly one with the other.

#### U.S. Seeks To 'Penetrate' Shield

LC251646 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1421 GMT 25 Mar 85

["Preparing First Nuclear Strike"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 23 Mar (TASS) -- TASS military observer Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

"We will cover all of America with a reliable shield," say representatives of the U.S. Administration, trying to convince Americans to pay many billions of dollars for the "star wars" program. "The antimissile defense system with space-based elements will defend you too," Washington says to calm its allies, trying to harness them to its "star chariot." "We will make nuclear weapons powerless and obsolete," the U.S. President says, trying to calm the entire alarmed world.

All these promises and slogans, however, are in reality an absolute bluff. They in Washington would like to make their nuclear strategic weapons not "powerless" and "obsolete" but more powerful so that they need not "fear" the other side's defense. Aiming at this goal the United States does not restrict itself to developing a system which will secure "an antimissile shield" but, simultaneously, in strict secrecy, they carry out intensive work on increasing means for penetrating the antimissile defense of the potential enemy. According to the British paper OBSERVER, within the framework of the secret program the United States is developing "future strategic missile systems" with maneuverable warheads for strategic missiles, dipole reflectors and light-reflecting sprays which can be dispersed on the trajectory of missiles and deceive antimissile defense detection and tracing equipment, devices to confuse the enemy's defense with false "targets," radar means, and so on.

All this is intended to ensure the possibility for American missiles to "penetrate" the antimissile "shield" if it should be created in the Soviet Union. Work is being done not only in laboratories. During the recent test of an MX missile over the Pacific, 2 of its 10 warheads, which flew on a trajectory

different to that of the others, were launched in the framework of a fixed program. The intention is that, in the future, maneuverable warheads will be installed not only on MX missiles but also on the new Midgetman missiles. In the draft budget for fiscal 1986 allocations for the program are doubled compared with this year--from \$98 million to \$174 million.

According to Western military experts, the very existence of this program shows that "President Reagan's ideas about the ideal system to reduce the effectiveness of nuclear weapons to nil is an illusion." However, one must face the truth and call things by their true names. This is not an illusion but deliberate deception.

In publicizing and embellishing his star wars "dream" the head of the White House once said in the heat of the moment that he would allegedly be ready to "share" antimissile defense technology with the Soviet Union. The President prefers not to recall this now. It is now being said openly in West Europe that, since work is being conducted in the United States on creating the means to overcome antimissile defense, Washington has never had any such intention. Once again it is just empty words.

The U.S. administration's practical deeds attest to just one thing: its preparations for the potential to inflict a nuclear first strike. While talking profusely about "defense," official Washington is carrying out a qualitative and quantitative buildup of strategic nuclear armaments, carrying out work on a large-scale antimissile defense system, and creating the means to overcome a similar antimissile defense of a potential enemy. Its strivings and hopes are clear--it is, after overcoming the other side's defense, to inflict a disarming nuclear strike on it and, albeit partially repelling the now weakened retaliatory strike on its won territory, to win a nuclear war.

These hopes are indeed illusory. The creation of an antimissile defense will only lead to an expansion of the arms race in accordance with the law that "an action gives rise to a counteraction," a sharp upset of strategic stability, a heightening of the threat of nuclear war, and a lowering of security both for the United States and for its allies.

#### End to Preparations Urged

LD221801 Moscow TASS in English 1704 GMT 22 Mar 85

["'Star Wars' Preparation Must Be Ended"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow March 22 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

There are different kinds of anniversaries: Some are celebrated, other remembered with sorrow. It is to the latter that the second anniversary of U.S. President Reagan's speech on March 23, 1983, belongs: He announced on that day the U.S. so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative." According to THE NEW YORK TIMES, that speech caught unawares even some of presidential advisers, while veteran Pentagon men asked each other: "What the devil does this strategic defence mean?"

Their surprise was clearly feigned. The "Initiative," which came to be known in the USA as the "star wars" programme, well fitted Washington's course of seeking military

superiority. Having failed to tip strategic parity in its favour on earth, Washington decided to achieve this in space. The main plan behind the establishment of a large space-based ABM system is to try to secure the possibility to use with impunity the "irresistible nuclear sword" and to give a "new meaning" to the strategy of first nuclear strike and to the concepts of "limited" and "protracted" nuclear wars. The actual implementation of the "star wars" concept would lead to the development of weapons of aggression, expanding the first strike potential.

The U.S. Administration is pressing for larger and larger funds to sustain the arms race. Speaking at a press-conference in the White House on March 21, the U.S. President tried to revitalise his campaign of unprecedented pressure on congressmen in a bid to secure appropriations for the further buildup of the U.S. strategic nuclear potential and reiterated the intention to intensify work on the "star wars" programme.

Washington has been trying hard for two years now to conceal the true meaning of the "star wars" programme. Spokesmen for the administration point to the defensive character of the "initiative" and claim that it would contribute to stronger stability, "render nuclear weapons impotent" and make them "obsolete."

But sensible people all over the world clearly realise the grave danger posed to the world by Washington's "initiative." It is aimed at subverting the treaty on the ABM systems, which was concluded in perpetuity and which constitutes the cornerstone of the limitation of strategic armaments, and at disrupting the organic relationship between limitations on defensive and offensive strategic systems, which would have an extremely adverse effect on prospects for the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union will immediately counter the U.S. attempts to tip the military balance. In this way the "initiative" will give an impetus to another, even costlier and more dangerous round of the arms race, a race in both defensive and especially offensive armaments. Washington's hopes that "the Russians will be unable to keep up with us" are absolutely groundless. The Soviet Union will never allow strategic parity to be upset. It is just too bad for the world that this parity will be restored at a higher level of armaments.

The only sensible way to strengthen stability and remove the threat of nuclear war is to reach agreement on the immediate ending of the arms race, primarily the race in nuclear weapons, on earth and on preventing it in space.

The Soviet Union keeps reiterating the firmness and consistency of its course of actual and major reductions in the arms arsenals, a course against the development of ever new weapon systems in space or on earth. The interests of mankind demand that the possibilities opened by the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva be not missed. It is more than time to put an end to dangerous "star wars" preparations.

CSO: 5200/1062

SPACE ARMS

FRENCH VIEWS ON SDI, NUCLEAR DETERRENCE EXAMINED

Zurich NEUE ZUERCHER ZEITUNG in German 9 Mar 85 p 4

[Article by Ch.M.: "On the Eve of the Impending Visit to Moscow by Minister for External Relations Dumas: Opposition to France's Negative Attitude on 'Star Wars'--Complaints by the Military Against Unshakable Strategic Concepts"]

[Text] For the first time, criticism has been leveled by military sources against France's self-justification policy concerning those aspects of space-based anti-missile systems which undermine the credibility of France's own nuclear defense. In addition, Moscow's verbal attacks on Bonn because of the latter's readiness to participate in the U.S. research project place the French opposition to "Star Wars" into seeming collusion with Kremlin interests, since it appears to want to "negotiate away" the danger to the "force de dissuasion" [deterrence force] because of its inability to take effective countermeasures. Minister of External Relations Dumas plans to follow in Genscher's footsteps by going to Moscow to "consult" with the Soviets in this matter immediately prior to the start of the superpowers' arms talks in Geneva.

For the first time in France, a general officer on active duty (hiding, however, behind the pseudonym "Hoplites") has criticized the Leftist government's policy of heaping skepticism on Reagan's DSI as to its technological feasibility and relegating to the distant future any effective impact of the "Star Wars" concept which it claims to be 15 to 20 years away. This warning, published by LE MONDE, stated that "war in space will force us to reexamine our concepts, programs and armed forces." Criticism is directed also against "soothing voices from certain quarters" which claim that there is no cause for alarm since nuclear deterrence is "good for another 20 to 30 years." This attitude claims the author, constitutes an ostrich policy which advocates doing absolutely nothing. Drawing an incisive parallel with the situation in 1939, when shortly before their defeat the French were still singing "tout va tres bien, Madame la Marquise," the author warns that France is already lagging far behind in space technology and must get moving in a hurry. As a first step in this direction, this opponent of officially decreed optimism and stagnation proposes the creation of a National Space Technology Commission, to be organized along the lines of the Atomic Energy Commission which created France's independent nuclear

defense force. The author of the LE MONDE article rebuts the officially expressed hope that France could save itself a space effort in view of the superpowers' arms control agreement, by stating that those negotiations merely serve to reinforce "the Soviet-U.S. preeminence." In addition, he claims, Moscow's shrill opposition to the United States' SDI program is designed, just as was its propaganda campaign against the neutron weapon, to maintain the Soviet capability for a disabling strike against the West without having to make new efforts toward penetrating a defensive system.

For the first time in France, this published criticism of official policy goes on to propose the establishment of a limited defensive system, designed to "protect our four or five largest cities and our nuclear arsenal." This proposal, based on the impending spread of a nuclear potential to smaller countries, is entirely new and reflects the realization (not touched upon in French discussions to date) that the United States is not primarily working on an "entirely impenetrable defensive shield" but rather on a gradual establishment of strategic defensive measures.

#### General Copel's Ideas

Two weeks earlier, retired Air Force General Copel had criticized in a FIGARO article those specialists who were worried about their own dogma and called for energetic support of the U.S. efforts, rather than impeding them. He rejected as being "entirely illogical" official objections according to which "nothing could happen for another 25 years" or that the SDI program could lead to "disengaging Europe" from the defense of the United States. He then went on to renew his previous proposal to supplement France's nuclear force, which is based entirely on use of ballistic missiles, by developing a cruise missile in order to diversify the potential for offensive nuclear reprisal in a manner at least partially compatible with an SDI defense. Copel thus voiced his opinion that the credibility of France's nuclear force could and must be maintained. While rejecting the "disengagement" argument launched last year by President Mitterrand and then-Minister for External Relations Cheysson by citing "the Americans' indisputable intention of defending Europe," the former air force general gave the impression of being mainly interested in prolonging the life expectancy of France's autonomous force de frappe. By simultaneously accepting French advantages deriving from a U.S. defensive system without actually saying so, he appeared to be interested mainly in an improved penetration capability for the national nuclear force.

However, the French government is quite at odds with such a view. Indeed, on June 12 of last year, it has its representative to the permanent Geneva arms reduction conference propose a moratorium on space weapons which, while not completely prohibiting research activities, comes suspiciously close to the Kremlin position. This reflected the first phase of the official French campaign against Reagan's initiative: a frontal critical assault was to discredit the U.S. project, while at the same time mobilizing the European allies against it. During his visit to Moscow last June, President Mitterrand reiterated France's request for "technological consultations with the superpowers on space matters," for which the Kremlin



had at first merely professed "interest." Shortly thereafter, Minister for External Relations Cheysson, in an interview with the newspaper LA CROIX, urged early discussions with Washington, which he had already asked for previously and which took place discreetly last July between mid-level officials. At that moment Paris maintained a policy of sharp opposition, based on reproaches about an alleged disengagement of Europe from the U.S. stronghold and about starting yet another round of the arms escalation. Finally, on 16 December, President Mitterrand climaxed this negative attitude in a TV address, in which he gave short shrift to U.S. plans as an "arms escalation," without using a single word to criticize the militarization of space long since initiated by the Soviets.

#### A Change Following Announcement of the Geneva Negotiations

Paris modified its obstructionist attitude only after the Geneva agreement of the superpowers of 7 January on the resumption of the arms talks, this time including space weapon plans. Its critical assault tactics were replaced by an emphatic declaration of extreme skepticism toward the technological feasibility of a defensive shield by reiterating the position that for the foreseeable future the deterrent value of the French nuclear force stood beyond any doubt. Reagan's National Security Advisor McFarlane had made this statement to the French, and Paul Nitze had done likewise more recently. Similarly, French Defense Minister Hernu had called attention to the continuing construction program of the U.S. Trident submarine, though on 9 November he had very quietly announced a modest research program for development of penetration aids for the new M 4 submarine missile as a first reaction to SDI. The new French tactics, whose logic was recently thoroughly demolished by Richard Burt, head of the State Department's European Desk, without identifying their source, received their finishing touch by Mitterrand's diplomatic advisor, Vedrine. He declared that Reagan's new initiative "appeared at first blush to be extremely attractive" because of its new philosophy of retreating from the mutual threat of nuclear destruction. However, he then continued by attacking it, stating that it would be more likely to lead to destabilization and to a new round of the arms race, since a perfect protective defense shield would not be feasible for a long time to come. He totally ignored the possibility of potential intermediate solutions. The French position, pleasantly camouflaged in skepticism, concentrated throughout on doubts concerning a foolproof missile defense system.

#### Praise from PRAVDA

Hernu, who made these points in a speech on 9 February in Munich, understandably was the subject of praise by PRAVDA. Having in the meantime recognized the potential for creating dissension which was being offered to them, the Soviets agreed to Mitterrand's proposal for consultations. They suggested that high-level talks be conducted. Even though Paris was anxious to soften its disagreements with Washington, it could hardly do anything but agree. Even though officially this was to be an exchange of opinions rather than negotiations, LE MONDE warned pointedly that Paris should "not throw itself into the arms of the Soviets." This will be

brought to a test with Dumas's trip to Moscow. On the surface, he too appears to want to downplay the issue. While he recognizes the SDI's "element of attractiveness in its entirely new philosophy," he declares that "the French and British are not worried since they are convinced that they have 15 to 20 years in which to make up their minds." The fact that London has changed its initial opposition is not the only reason that France, by using optimistic autosuggestion, could end up in embarrassing isolation vis-a-vis Moscow. The fact that the Kremlin is accusing the FRG of complicity in torpedoing all efforts at arms control because of its willingness to participate in SDI research, threatens to exacerbate the differences between Paris and Bonn resulting from France's status as a nuclear power, to the detriment of the Western Alliance. France's efforts at salvaging its exaggerated status as a nuclear power, which could be threatened with downgrading by SDI technology, are putting an extremely heavy strain on its European and transatlantic alliance relationships.

9273

CSO: 5200/2527

SPACE ARMS

CANADA'S NRC PRESIDENT DOUBTS STAR WARS CAN BE PURELY DEFENSIVE

Vancouver THE SUN in English 22 Mar 85 p A19

[Article by Moira Farrow]

[Text]

National Research Council president Larkin Kerwin doubts the controversial U.S. Star Wars plan could ever be a purely defensive system.

He was commenting in an interview Thursday on the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative, a space-based anti-missile research program popularly known as Star Wars.

"It's surprising to me to hear so much debate about a subject which is so little developed, no one really knows what it means," said Kerwin, a physicist who holds the top science job in Canada.

"Personally, I'm not optimistic that the Americans will be able to develop a purely defensive system. That has been the aim of mankind for thousands of years but no one has yet come up with a purely defensive system. You would have to invent anti-gravity to make it work."

Kerwin was interviewed at the Expo 86 symposium on transportation and communications being held this week at the Four Seasons Hotel.

He said it will take many years of research to find out what sort of a Star Wars system is feasible.

"I would encourage the research if anyone could come up with a purely defensive system but I am not in the slightest optimistic that anyone will," said Kerwin.

He said the closest the world has ever come to such a system is the wall and even that structure has "offensive qualities" because it can enclose people.

"In fact, that's what the U.S. wants to build -- an impenetrable wall against incoming missiles," Kerwin said. "But I think the effort put into it (Star Wars) would be a great diversion of resources into an ill-defined problem."

But the scientist had high praise for this week's

announcement that Canada will spend \$8.8 million this year on further assessment of its decision to join the U.S. space station project.

"In effect, Canada is joining the NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration) space program and the National Research Council is the lead agency to fund the studies," he said. "I find it very interesting that we're the lead agency but to find the necessary funds is less interesting."

He said the NRC has to find \$8.8 million in its current operating budget to finance the first year of the project but the \$15 million in the following year will be "new money" from the government.

Kerwin said he will find this year's financing by postponing some NRC research and equipment purchases.

"It's a very exciting decision and a great opportunity for space science in Canada," he said. "If a decision is made to go ahead to join the program it will cost about half a billion dollars over the next seven years."

CSO: 5220/04

SPACE ARMS

POSSIBILITY OF CANADIAN STAR WARS RESEARCH INVOLVEMENT DISCUSSED

Mulroney on Job Creation

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 25 Mar 85 p 1

[Article by Charlotte Montgomery]

[Text] OTTAWA — Prime Minister Brian Mulroney says he would be willing to consider Canadian involvement in research for the United States' Star Wars program if the result was to create jobs.

However, he noted that no one has proposed Canadian participation in the \$26-billion U.S. defence project, which is aimed at designing a space-based anti-missile system. And he emphasized that his Government's support for the controversial program is for its research phase only.

"I suppose if somebody came forward and said, would we be interested in bidding for a part of a contract which would create, say, 10,000 jobs in Winnipeg-Fort Garry, I think we would have to take a look at it," Mr. Mulroney told a news conference in Ottawa on Saturday evening.

Winnipeg-Fort Garry riding is held by Liberal MP Lloyd Axworthy, who opposes the U.S. program because he believes it escalates the arms race. The Liberals oppose the involvement of Canadian companies and scientists in any research under the program, which is formally called the Strategic Defence Initiative.

The Prime Minister told reporters that if the Government did not consider a proposal that might create jobs for the Manitoba riding, "Mr. Axworthy would be up in the House (of Commons) and there's only so much of Mr. Axworthy's outrage that I can, and the country, can accommodate."

Asked if he would also consider a contract under SDI that would create jobs in his own home town of Baie-Comeau, Que., Mr. Mulroney said he would "consult with the local member."

The Prime Minister's expression of interest in considering Canadian involvement in SDI research is the third in recent days from senior Conservatives.

In Commons committee meetings, both Defence Minister Erik Nielsen and External Affairs Minister Joe Clark have noted the significant economic spinoff that a \$26-billion program would have. The two ministers have refused to say whether or not the federal Government intends to have some involvement, perhaps by encouraging or arranging in some way for Canadian companies to bid on such contracts.

Potential Canadian involvement was raised publicly last week by U.S. President Ronald Reagan in a speech at Quebec City. At that time, Mr. Reagan referred to "the possibility of developing and sharing with you technology that could provide a security shield and some day eliminate the threat of nuclear attack."

Mr. Clark has stressed that there has been no formal invitation from the United States to involve Canada in the research program and that, consequently, no Canadian response has been formulated. He and Mr. Nielsen, however, have noted that the "options are open" for Canada.



## Mulroney, Opposition Leaders

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 29 Mar 85 pp 1, 2

[Text]

**BAIE-COMEAU, Que. (CP-Staff)** — Prime Minister Brian Mulroney expressed serious reservations yesterday about the U.S. invitation to join research on a space-based anti-missile program.

Supporting research done by the United States — the position taken by Canada and other nations — is one thing, Mr. Mulroney told a news conference in Baie Comeau.

"It is another — quite another — to be invited to participate actively in a project where you are not the big player, where you don't set the thrust and where you have no control over the parameters.

"These are important matters. It's one thing that we assert our commitment to our friends and to the strength of NATO, and it's another for a country like Canada to go beyond that."

Mr. Mulroney's remarks seemed to suggest the Government might, as Australia has done, refuse the U.S. invitation to participate in Star Wars research.

However, remarks made earlier in the news conference seemed to lean the other way.

In a perfect world the project would not be necessary and the \$26-billion the United States plans to spend on finding a way to stop incoming missiles could be diverted to more productive purposes, Mr. Mulroney said.

"But the world isn't perfect, and we have to recognize that reality and play our role and assume our full responsibility in trying to perfect it."

"What we do will be in the interests of Canada as a sovereign nation, a loyal ally and as a believer in freedom. Those are the criteria upon which the decision will be made."

In Ottawa, Defence Minister Erik Nielsen sounded a note of caution about the prospect of Canadian participation in the U.S. research program.

However, External Affairs Minister Joe Clark put the possibility of Canada accepting the U.S. invitation in a more positive light, noting the jobs which might be created in this country by joining in the \$26-billion research venture.

The two ministers did not contradict each other in their answers to questions in the Commons, but they touched on the two sides of the issue which the Government appears to be juggling as it considers what to do.

Mr. Nielsen, who had returned from a meeting of North Atlantic Treaty Organi-

zation defence ministers in Luxembourg, listened receptively to a suggestion that a committee of MPs might examine the implications of Canadian participation in the Star Wars program, formally known as the Strategic Defence Initiative.

"We are well aware that there are significant political and strategic implications to the research program," Mr. Nielsen said, advising that any report from a Commons committee to deal with the issue would be given "every possible attention."

He said that there are questions of substance which MPs may want to raise in

either the Commons or in a committee meeting.

Mr. Clark was asked by New Democratic Party external affairs critic Pauline Jewett to admit that research under such programs inevitably leads to development and deployment of systems. With the Star Wars program, such an outcome would mean the abandonment of the strategy of deterrence, threaten the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union and divert huge sums of money into an arms race in space, she said.

Mr. Clark said he did not share her view and noted that other NATO members also did not see the Star Wars program in that light. In Luxembourg, the NATO ministers unanimously urged the United States to continue the space research program.

Miss Jewett told him that, despite his and Mr. Mulroney's comments about the job-creating potential of the program, more jobs per dollar are produced by forms of spending other than military spending.

"We accept the view that, when the Soviet Union is involved in research relating to what could be broadly called their Strategic Defence Initiative, it is prudent for our side, for the NATO alliance to be involved in research of that kind," Mr. Clark said.

"If research that Canada might be involved in also means jobs for Canadians, we would not turn it aside because it meant jobs for Canadians," he said.

Miss Jewett was loudly jeered by Conservative MPs when she said

the Soviet Union is not interested in engaging in a "race in space." She asked Mr. Clark to pursue the issue of Soviet goals for space when he meets Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko during a week-long visit to the Soviet Union which begins this weekend.

Liberal Leader John Turner used Mr. Nielsen's return to play upon the embarrassment which Mr. Clark suffered this week when he was caught unaware of an invitation to Canada to participate in the Star Wars program. Mr. Clark had denied there was any such invitation even though news reports said letters had been given to all NATO ministers, including Mr. Nielsen.

#### Cruise Tests Link

Toronto THE SATURDAY STAR in English 23 Mar 85 pp A1, A14

[Article by Peter Goodspeed]

[Text] WASHINGTON--Cruise missile flights over Canada are expected to be used to test a new U.S. Air Force spy satellite that will play a major role in President Ronald Reagan's Star Wars space defence program, The Star has learned.

The link between the ongoing cruise tests over northwestern Canada and the spy satellite to be launched next winter is indicated in partly censored Pentagon budget documents and interviews with U.S. defence analysts in Washington.

These show that, despite official denials, Canada may already be slated to play a crucial role in the development and testing of space-based weapons involved in Star Wars research.

Next January, when the U.S. Air Force launches its first top-secret military space shuttle flight from Vandenberg Air Force Base in California, U.S. scientists will send a super-sophisticated spy satellite, TEAL RUBY, into orbit over Canada's far north.

#### Detect Bombers

The satellite, developed over 10 years at a cost of \$241 million, carries sophisticated infra-red sensors designed to detect Soviet strategic bombers and low-flying cruise missiles as they fly across the Canadian north.

But partly censored Pentagon budget documents released to the U.S. Congress a year ago explicitly state that TEAL RUBY will be tested "using co-operative air vehicle targets...such as cruise missiles."

9 May 1985

The spy satellite's test flight is scheduled to take place at exactly the same time the U.S. Air Force will be resuming tests on the cruise missile in Canada.

Last month, the U.S. Air Force held the first in a series of free-flight cruise missile tests over Canada as part of an agreement the former Liberal government signed with the United States.

While details of the test flight are being kept secret by the Pentagon, eight-pages of budget briefing papers describe the new satellite as "one of the most sophisticated space software developments ever undertaken."

The Pentagon papers also say the tests will be conducted to gather "background measurements required for the design of future operational sensors."

And the papers say the TEAL RUBY experiments will be conducted "on a worldwide basis and under a variety of climatological and geographic conditions . . . with emphasis on geographic regions critical to U.S. air and fleet defence."

Officials in the U.S. Defence Department and the office of the Strategic Defence Initiative — as Star Wars is formally called — refused to discuss the TEAL RUBY project with The Star and wouldn't say whether Canada is directly involved in the project.

But the Pentagon budget papers describes the test as an "international co-operation effort."

"The TEAL RUBY international co-operation effort, . . . (blanked out space) . . . has been formulated and chartered . . . (blanked out space) . . . in order to facilitate the joint experiments and to exchange data in co-operative defence areas," the documents said.

Since Canada lies directly in the path of any potential Soviet cruise missile or bomber attack on the United States, defence analysts in Washington say it is "extremely likely and highly probable" the United States will combine their TEAL RUBY tests with the ongoing round of cruise missile tests in Canada.

While TEAL RUBY is not officially part of the Star Wars program, the Pentagon documents say the new satellite will provide basic

scientific information for the development of a whole series of Star Wars research projects.

Its research will be used in developing the Space Based Laser and the Air Force Anti-Satellite (ASAT) programs as well as in developing an Air Force Advanced Warning System, an Air Force Space Based Surveillance System and a Navy Integrated Tactical Surveillance System, the Pentagon papers say.

The TEAL RUBY tests are just the beginning of Canada's involvement in the Star Wars, says John Pike, associate director for Space Policy with the Federation of American Scientists, a group that is strongly opposed to Star Wars research.

"I think Canada is already well enmeshed in this program," Pike said in an interview.

"It's not just the TEAL RUBY program or SDI research, there are so many modalities in the Canadian-U.S. defence relationship that it would take a huge effort to step back from this and reconsider Canadian involvement. Canadian-U.S. co-operation in strategic defence doesn't leave Canada much room to manoeuvre independently of the United States."

While the TEAL RUBY tests are technically an air defence project, the technology involved has a direct application to Star Wars research, Pike said.

#### Present Research Projects

Windsor THE WINDSOR STAR in English 29 Mar 85 p A10

[Text] TORONTO (CP)--Research on high-energy lasers that may be used in the U.S. Star Wars defence plan is already being done in Canada, financed by grants from the Canadian and United States governments.

A University of Toronto scientist is receiving grants from the federal government and the U.S. Air Force for research that could lead to development of an

X-ray laser--a device the U.S. military believes is the key to space defence against nuclear attack.

Raymond Measures, a physicist at the University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, says he has been receiving money from the U.S. Air Force for eight years for research that could help develop the X-ray laser.

Measures said Thursday in an interview the research is basic science that is "contributing to the pool of knowledge" the air force has "always been prepared to support."

PAUL STARES, a space weapons analyst at the Brookings Institute in Washington, said such research--involving short-wavelength and X-ray lasers--could be useful in developing a space-based weapon system against ballistic missiles.

"Any sort of research in this area that increases our understanding of the dynamics of X-ray lasers or the control of them could have direct military applications," Stares said in a telephone interview. "If they are funding this type of research, they must be thinking of using it."

Measures said the creation of an X-ray laser "could certainly make the Strategic Defence Initiative possible."

However, research into short-wavelength lasers could have other uses, such as enabling the study of molecule construction in greater detail.

"THERE ARE A lot of people who say you shouldn't do this type of research because it can be used in the Strategic Defence Initiative," Measures said. "But what we are doing is basic science, which can be used for either good or bad."

Measures said the U.S. Air force is not in regular contact with him, and his work is not classified.

Department of External Affairs officials told the Toronto Globe and Mail they have "no record" of U.S.-financed laser studies, although other federal departments might know of them.

Measures would not say how much money he receives from the air force, but said it is more than the funding he receives from Canada's Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council. His research budget is about \$100,000 a year.

Measures, noting that X-ray lasers would be effective in the U.S. space weapon defence plan because they release enormous amounts of energy rapidly, said developing such a laser is a long-range goal that probably won't be achieved by his university team within the next two decades.

CSO: 5220/04

9 May 1985

## SPACE ARMS

## 'INCONSISTENCIES' SEEN IN CARRINGTON'S OSLO SPEECH

LD170908 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1630 GMT 16 Apr 85

[Commentary by Alois Tomasek: "His Lordship's Simple-Mindedness"]

[Text] The NATO secretary general's job is unquestionably important and responsible. Nonetheless, the audience at Lord Carrington's lecture in Oslo was partly bored and partly amused. Some were bored by his admonishments about the danger from the East and the Soviet threat which they have heard so many times before; the others listening more attentively, were amused by his lordship's efforts to reconcile the irreconcilable.

It was not difficult to see that behind the stipulation, and I quote, that all positive answers too complex and important questions must be answers from the alliance as a whole, was a request to the United States to be kind enough to respect the interests and views of its allies when decisions on important problems are being adopted; a request, coyly put, and equally modest and naive, since the roughneck policy of the United States follows only one motto--What is good for the United States is good for the rest of the world. The interests of the other members of the alliance are of secondary importance.

And then the lord attempted some artistic leaps on the tightrope of international politics to prove that he favors peace but that he also favors the arms race. (?He said) that it would be very unwise for the United States not to continue its own research in view of the USSR's potential in this sphere--meaning research in the sphere of space weapons. Without the Soviet Union which, lo and behold, has a technical advantage in precisely the weapons which the United States is planning to develop, his lordship would find it very difficult to justify developing and producing new types of instruments of war. But so as not to frighten people he hastens to add: We do not seek security at the expense of the Soviet Union. That would have been wonderful, if he had not gone on to say: Military superiority and disarmament are an inherent part of our policy. It follows, that military superiority is the aim of which will enable them to dictate conditions for disarmament. This is confirmed by another gem as political statements go: We are prepared to negotiate on all the specific proposals which we have put forward. You have heard correctly. NATO is prepared to negotiate on the proposals which it itself has put forward. There is no mention of Soviet proposals. And so gem follows gem,



and one of them takes into account that the other side, too, has something to say regarding international affairs, that it is not willing to agree to NATO's military superiority over itself. After all, nobody likes to negotiate under military pressure.

To be brief, the NATO secretary general's explanation of the new tactics of the NATO countries simply was not a success. Apart from [words indistinct] it contains nothing new and the attempt to mislead the world public by a pretence of good will is futile. Just like the audience in Oslo, part of the world public is bored by the old claims, but the greater part is smiling at the naivety of Lord Carrington's statement.

CSO: 5200/3038

SALT/START ISSUES

REAGAN HIT FOR LINKING MX FUNDING, ARMS TALKS

Pressure on Congress

LD211711 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1515 GMT 21 Mar 85

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko]

[Text] Washington, 21 Mar (TASS)--In accordance with established procedure, the Senate has for the second time rubber stamped a decision to satisfy the administration's demand for the allocation of \$1.5 million in the budget for the 1985 fiscal year, to be spent on construction of 21 MX missiles, which will be additional to the same number of these first-strike nuclear weapons already in production. As was the case during the first vote, 55 senators followed the administration's bidding. Forty-five senators voted against. A vote will be taken in the House of Representatives next week.

It is noted here that the administration managed to win support for its militaristic program mainly through an unprecedented campaign of pressure on Congress. During the days leading up to the Senate vote, Ronald Reagan put intense pressure on the senators in order to force them to endorse the Pentagon's request. The President paid a personal visit to the Capitol, where he tried to convince each senator that the continuation of the MX program was a matter of exceptional importance. He demagogically asserted that the implementation of the MX program would enable the United States to demonstrate to the Soviet Union its determination to reach agreement on strategic armaments at the Geneva talks.

Some members of Congress admitted that they had been telephoned by Kampelman, the head of the U.S. delegation of the Geneva talks, and his deputy, Tower. During the telephone conversations, Kampelman and Tower appealed to them to vote for MX. They alleged that without these missiles the U.S. position at the talks with the Soviet Union would be weakened. In other words, while participating in the talks on disarmament, the U.S. representatives were at the same time campaigning in favor of the arms race.

In its efforts to manipulate Congress, the administration is now turning its attention to the House of Representatives, where two rounds of voting on the MX program are to take place next week. It is considered here that the White House will ultimately succeed in "twisting the arm" of most members of the

lower house and obtaining the outcome to the vote which it needs. The House Armed Services Committee, where the tone is set by stooges of the Pentagon, has already come out in support of the MX program. However, opposition to the militaristic program is greater in the House of Representatives than in the upper house of Congress. This is shown, in particular, by the fact that its Appropriations Committee voted against the continuation of the MX program. It is vitally important, Senator Lautenberg stated, to halt the arms race, to seek an agreement with the USSR on arms control, and not to try to upset the strategic equilibrium by deploying MX missiles. He described the administration's allegations that this program will help to bring about progress at the Soviet-U.S. negotiations as the height of cynicism and hypocrisy.

The course of the debate on the MX program in Congress again shows that White House statements about U.S. aspirations for peace, reduction and even elimination of strategic nuclear armaments bear no relation to its actions, which are aimed at forging ahead with the arms race, extending it to space, and securing the potential for getting away with a first strike--in other words, preparations for unleashing a nuclear war.

#### 'Absurd Slogan'

LD211602 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1445 GMT 21 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow, 21 Mar (TASS)--Vladimir Bogachev, TASS observer on military questions, writes:

If some high-ranking "innovator" in Washington proposed to start the fight against crime in the United States by organizing courses to improve the qualifications of robbers and tyrants, they would probably think he was crazy and might even give him the sack. However, the Reagan administration has, in the course of 4 years, been trying to convince the American public that the only reliable path towards arms limitation and reduction lies through the intensive buildup of MX, Trident and Pershing II missiles, and through transferring the arms race to outer space. In a country which once prided itself on the common sense of its citizens, one can daily find a number of "experts" who are prepared to seriously discuss the merits of this flimsy thesis in the press and on television.

"By voting for the MX missile," President Reagan assures the American legislators, "you are voting for the success of the Geneva talks." "If Congress cuts down on the program of the strategic modernization of the United States," echoes Kenneth Adelman, the director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, "little hope will remain of convincing the Russians to make real reductions in their strategic forces."

In the days prior to the voting in the Senate on allocations for the MX missile, President Reagan himself set off for the Capitol, and, by twisting the arms of the senators, tried to force them to see that the approval of this program would somehow enable the United States to demonstrate its determination to reach an agreement on strategic arms at Geneva. Larry Speakes, the White House's deputy press secretary, told journalists: "Our approach to the members of the House of Representatives will be the same as it was to the senators -- we will work on them day by day, one congressman after another."

President Reagan himself, in a rare moment of candor last year, declared: "As regards forces, we (the United States and the USSR) are almost equal. "In the February report of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which was delivered to Congress, the existence of "approximate nuclear parity between the United States and the Soviet Union" is admitted. And so there is of course no question of the United States' lagging behind in the military sphere, a situation which would have to be eliminated by the creation of such first-strike weapons as the MX ICBM's.

What is the meaning of the U.S. Administration's appeals for an accumulation of ever more modern means of mass destruction? What are the Washington representatives striving for in starting another spiral in the arms race?

There is only one answer that can be given to these questions. The present U.S. Administration is not happy with the existing parity of military forces between the Soviet Union and the United States. Washington is striving to break loose from the "chains of parity" and achieve military superiority over the socialist countries.

This is why Washington has put forward the absurd slogan "Toward disarmament through an initial increase in U.S. weapons." This is the reason why the U.S. Administration, painting black white, is calling the first-strike nuclear missiles "a guarantee of peace."

For all their illusory nature and impossibility of fulfillment, Washington's plans for achieving military superiority are extremely dangerous for the cause of peace. They put under threat prospects for reducing, through talks, the danger of nuclear war.

The Soviet Union is not striving for military superiority, but it will not allow Washington's adventuristic plans for achieving world hegemony to be realized.

Washington should realize that the creation of new American nuclear weapons systems will only set in motion the "action against action" chain. As a result, parity will be reestablished, but at a higher and more dangerous level. The way towards an elimination of the nuclear war threat does not lie through an expansion of the arms race, as the U.S. President asserts, but through conducting honorable, serious talks based on the principle of equality and equal security of the sides.

#### Peace Committee Official

LD212240 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 21 Mar 85

[Commentary by Genrikh Borovik from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As has already been reported, the U.S. Senate has decided to satisfy the administration's requests to make \$1.5 billion available in the 1985 budget for construction of 21 MX missiles. Over to the writer Genrikh Borovik, deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace:

[Borovik to camera] Hello comrades. The voting you have heard about was very tense. Right up until the last day, it was difficult to forecast the outcome. The administration's representatives spent all their time on Capitol Hill, buttonholing and accosting the senators, shepherding them into corners and accompanying them everywhere. The vice president of the United States, the secretary of state, the secretary of defense, rank-and-file employees of the White House and the Pentagon, all of them

alike, were doing this. However, it was left to the President to deal the final blow. We remember how several months prior to the November elections last year, the U.S. President began, all of a sudden, to deliver peacemaking speeches. The press took it upon itself to prove that, at long last, he had become an experienced and wise politician, had taken the peace idea to heart, and was ready to put right relations with the USSR. He even accepted our country's proposal to hold talks in Geneva.

However, the Geneva talks commenced on 12 March, and already on 19 March the Senate was adopting a decision to finance a new batch of the first-strike MX missiles. And it was here, at this juncture, that those who had lent credibility to the President's sincerity began to have their doubts: It was as if something was not quite right.

It was at that time that they heard a battle cry. While visiting Canada on the eve of the voting, the President delivered an anti-Soviet speech in his best old tradition: both about the struggle against the darkness of communism, and that the time has come to halt the Soviet Union; about the warm rays of the sun of bourgeois democracy; and, naturally, about our violations of treaties and so forth.

On his return from Canada, he graced the Senate with his presence in order to persuade, convince, and threaten. If you do not give us the \$1.5 billion, the many billions already spent on MX will be lost, he said. If you do not stock up with them, the program of new, offensive arms technologically bound up with MX will go out the window. He even said the following: A vote for the MX is a vote for universal peace, hinting that a vote against can be regarded as betrayal of national security interests. The main argument was left until the end: The new MX missiles will strengthen the position of the U.S. delegation in Geneva. He was contradicted: How will the position of the U.S. delegation in Geneva be strengthened indeed? After all, the talks underway there are not about arms increases, but about arms limitations. Well, in this way: The American delegation in Geneva shows flexibility and earnestly and sincerely strives for deep reductions in nuclear arms, said the President. The MX and disarmament go hand in hand. I am not parodying; the President of the United States used these very words: "earnestly and sincerely" and "hand in hand."

An illogical and amoral position? Undoubtedly. Dangerous to peace? And how. But, sometimes I think that it is not often that one can expect logic, morality, and conscience from the rulers of a society in which there exist groups of people making money on manufacturing means of destruction and on blood. After all, the very system which is capable of enriching itself on war is illogical and amoral.

Of course, apart from the sweet thought of huge billions, there is also here an even more honeylike hope. Suppose that, having heard of the MX, the Russians will, nevertheless, take fright, renounce and retreat from everything, from socialism, from the communist idea, and, with them, the whole world will take fright and retreat? And everything would again be like it was in the olden days, like it was before, at the beginning of the century and, better still maybe, in the last century? Oh, what delightful dreams! They are dressed up in nice words about the warm rays of democracy, but they are underpinned by an idea which, incidentally, is a very old and banal one: to lay one's hands on everything and be master of everything.

In this context, one would like to remind the White House of history. I will be so bold as to voice my suspicion that they are not too well versed in this subject over there. I have in mind here events of 40 years ago. At that time, there also were talks, in Potsdam, and at that time attempts were also made to



9 May 1985

intimidate us a bit, with the atom bomb. Well, nothing came of it. One should do a bit of reading about this, and there are very good books around. And if they are partial to films in the White House, one can also recommend several films--not bad, not bad at all--documentary and feature films alike, made in our country quite recently. Everything is simple and easy to understand in them; the characters are to be seen there.

There is another piece of advice that one can give: A session of the World Peace Council opens in Moscow tomorrow. Let those in Washington listen to what people of the world are talking about and what they are thinking. It may prove very useful indeed.

#### Reagan Meets Journalists

LD222224 Moscow TASS in English 1830 GMT 22 Mar 85

["Washington's Course Is To Tip the Balance of Forces"--TASS headline]

[Text] The U.S. Administration plans to tip the existing balance of forces within the next year or two by deploying first-strike MX nuclear missiles. Washington is seeking to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union even before the United States begins to field components of its "star wars" defences. To this end senior administration officials resort to different ploys to prepare public opinion in the country and secure funds for the production of the second batch of 21 MX missiles. Some of them claim that MX missiles are "bargaining chips" at the talks with the Russians while others predict that the success of the Soviet-U.S. Geneva talks will depend exclusively on MX missiles. Still others go so far as claiming that MX missiles are being built just to be scrapped right away.

Meeting editors of provincial newspapers and radio stations at the White House, President Reagan stated that the immediate aim of his administration at the Geneva talks was to achieve reductions in American and Soviet offensive nuclear forces. He is echoed by Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, according to whom the United States seeks in the field of strategic nuclear weapons drastic reductions in the number and yields of the strategic forces rather than limitations on them.

So the United States is talking about "reductions" in strategic nuclear forces. But in the next breath, so to speak, the White House chiefs advocate the production and deployment of MX missiles and demand another 1.5 billion dollars for their manufacture.

U.S. Secretary of State Shultz pointed out openly in THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR that the administration had a program to build 100 missiles and that their deployment was to begin next year. MX nuclear strategic missiles, Shultz said, will complement the potential of the U.S. Navy and bomber Air Force.

But things do not stop here. According to the U.S. press, the deployment of 100 MX missiles is just the first of the three phases of the fulfillment of a top secret plan envisioning the deployment of at least 200 missiles of that type. This is what the striving of the White House to "reduce" nuclear potential looks like in practice.

But even this plan is not final, it appears. During congressional debates on MX funding, some of the law-makers pointed out obvious signs in the Reagan administration's plans that an attempt is being made to integrate into a single system MX first-strike nuclear missiles and the space-based antisatellite system; in other words, to incorporate 100-200 MX missiles into the infamous "star wars" program.

These seem to be the actual plans of the present leaders of the U.S. administration, while talk about the White House's commitment to the elimination of nuclear weapons is just a diversionary ploy.

#### Kampelman Summoned to Lobby

LD231748 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 23 Mar 85

[Text] Reports from Washington say that Max Kampelman, who heads the United States delegation at the current Soviet-American talks, has been summoned from Geneva by President Reagan. Mr Kampelman is to help persuade the House of Representatives of the United States Congress to endorse the appropriation of \$1.5 billion in the current fiscal year for the building of another 21 MX first-strike intercontinental ballistic missiles. The United States Administration has been making absurd claims that the missiles will help reach agreements on the arms race limitation at the Geneva talks.

#### Kampelman's 'Contradictory Tasks'

LD251555 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1529 GMT 25 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow, 25 Mar (TASS) -- Vladimir Boyachev, TASS military observer, writes:

It transpires that Max Kampelman, head of the U.S. delegation to the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms, is fulfilling two completely contradictory tasks. In Geneva, he is to conduct talks which are officially aimed at "preventing an arms race in space and putting a halt to it on earth", while in Washington he has been instructed to facilitate deployment [razvertyvaniye] of the very same arms systems which he is supposed to reduce in Geneva.

As the British say: "You can't have your cake and eat it too." According to the laws of logic, the Reagan administration can only set seriously one of these two mutually exclusive tasks. Which one?

The U.S. mass media reports that President Reagan has urgently called the head of the U.S. delegation in Geneva to Washington to ease the passage through Congress of the bill on appropriations for the production of a new batch of the MX intercontinental ballistic missiles. There is every reason to suppose that Kampelman has been set this task in all earnest.

Kampelman's urgent trip to Washington is yet another factor which makes one reflect on the real aims of the U.S. Administration at the Geneva talks. According to ABC, the head of the U.S. delegation in Geneva should "convince the Congress of the fact that the United States must have more nuclear weapons." Maybe he has also been given the task getting a blessing in Geneva for the deployment of a "large quantity of American nuclear weapons"? Or is he playing the role of Janus from Roman mythology, with one face for Washington and another for Geneva?

### U.S. Aims Questioned

LD260042 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 25 Mar 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Washington administration is stepping up pressure on Congress with the aim of pushing through the MX missile production program. Over to Valentin Zorin, political observer of Central Television:

[Zorin] Hello, comrades! It is difficult to surprise Washington habitués who have seen the world with political williness, but nevertheless, the White House has just succeeded in doing this. In Washington it was announced that during the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, the head of the U.S. delegation at these talks, Kampelman, was urgently called to the U.S. capital. Were new instructions necessary? Not at all. To the numerous questions from journalists, a White House spokesman replied that Kampelman's urgent recall was connected with the necessity to have him take a part in working over House of Representatives members who are faced with voting on new allocations for the MX missile. The logic of Washington leaders in this is primitively simple. They, you see, are in need of arguments to haggle with the Soviet Union, and put pressure on it. And so let them have the new missiles immediately, each with greater destructive power than all explosive devices used in World War II.

The White House reported that Kampelman is to convince legislators who are wavering under the pressure of public opinion that, they say, there exists a direct link between the Geneva talks and the allocations for the MX missile. I would not like to believe in such a cynical calculation -- to use deadly missiles as a tool for diplomatic bargaining -- but this is really what the White House is saying. The very same thing is being said by O'Neill, speaker of the House, who stressed that the administration is striving to use the new missiles as a trump card in the diplomatic game. According to him, however, the new missiles construction program, which will cost U.S. taxpayers the gigantic sum of \$41 billion, will not increase U.S. security, for there is a fundamental defect inherent in this power -- it is both vulnerable and destructive in a deadly way.

As for the unplanned and urgent trip by Kampelman, head of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks, to Washington to perform the role of pushing the new Pentagon military program, it must be observed that it contradicts radically and most decisively the task officially entrusted to him and the delegation led by him-- to conduct talks not on increasing, but reducing nuclear missile weapons, including MX type weapons. I will remark, incidentally, that Kampelman is leaving Geneva at the very time when discussion there was to begin on the problems of nonmilitarization of space. In connection with this, a legitimate question cannot but arise: What aims is Washington pursuing at the Geneva talks? Is it really preparing to strive for the halt of the nuclear missile arms race on earth and in space, or, is it using the talks as a screen, to free its hand for augmenting such a race?

'Trump Card' at Geneva

OW260901 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1100 GMT 25 Mar 85

[From the "World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] Voting is scheduled in the U.S. Congress tomorrow on the government's demand to apportion another \$1.5 billion for the production of a new batch of MX intercontinental ballistic missiles. On the eve of the voting, the White House is exerting overall pressure on congressmen to obtain their agreement to another militaristic act.

American observers note that on the eve of the voting, President Reagan, in his regular radio address, assailed Congress with sharp criticism. He advertised in every way his program of rearming America, categorically opposed reduction of military spending, and at the same time, demanded the elimination of many important social programs. Nevertheless, writes THE NEW YORK TIMES, the superiority in votes the administration had on the question of allocating appropriations for the production of another 21 MX missiles is evaporating, and supporters of the missile are for the first time frankly concerned that the program may be defeated. So, to strengthen pressure on congressmen, U.S. diplomat Kampelman, who heads the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks, has been urgently summoned to Washington on orders from the President. As reported by the U.S. CBS television company, President Reagan intends to include him in the lobbying campaign in favor of the MX missiles.

Indeed, it turns out that while still in Geneva, Kampelman called congressmen to persuade them to vote for appropriations for the missiles, and now continues to indoctrinate the deputies in person. How is one to reconcile this with the fact that the officially declared tasks of the Geneva talks are to cease the nuclear arms race on earth and not to permit it in space?

Equally odious are the statements resounding from the White House that the MX missiles will supposedly become some kind of trump card at the Geneva talks.

Well, one has to say that U.S. military and diplomatic experts are themselves admitting the fallacy of such assertions. Smith and Warnke, former leaders of U.S. delegations at the SALT talks, and also former U.S. Defense Secretary Clifford warned about this in a special notice on the pages of THE WASHINGTON POST. Citing this notice, former American astronaut and now Senator John Glenn, warning that the administration was intimidating Congress and engaging in behind-the-scenes propaganda, stated: In the sphere of armaments, we are already familiar with the long story of so-called trump cards at talks becoming an obstacle to the success of those talks.

I will add to this that the Washington administration is not only pushing the arms race in the United States itself, but also trying in every way to include U.S. military bloc allies in this. The latest testimony to this was the interview just given by U.S. General Rogers, commander in chief of the NATO Armed Forces. He not only expressed satisfaction that Belgium had finally begun deployment of cruise missiles, but also expressed the hope that the Netherlands



would make the same decision. As is known, NATO plans to deploy 48 cruise missiles on its territory.

However, the matter is not only confined to missiles. The same interview by General Rogers contains an unambiguous demand to also build up conventional armaments. The U.S. commander in chief specifically reported that he had already charged NATO staff with developing a so-called conceptual military framework on this question for the remainder of the current century and the beginning of the next. Here you have it: prospective planning for the arms race, even up to the year 2000, for a few generations in advance! However, these are the plans of U.S. generals; the people have other plans.

#### Falin Views Pressure on Congress

PM261049 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Mar 85 Morning Edition pp 4-5

[Article by Valentin Falin under the rubric "Political Observer's Opinion":  
"From the Imperial Standpoint"]

[Text] It is a good thing that over the years the international public has developed a certain immunity toward the attacks of militarism which periodically afflict Washington. Otherwise, in these March days it would certainly seem that the American leaders are expecting the end of the world any day now, and are therefore feverishly laying in all kinds of ammunition in quantities capable of surpassing all the known pyramids and burial mounds.

On closer examination, it becomes clear that in reality nothing extraordinary has happened outside the United States, unless you count the new Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms which have begun in Geneva. Moreover, you can learn from the words of the top representatives of the administration itself that the United States has reason to feel itself more secure than ever before in the last 25 years or so.

Where is the logic? Security is at a highpoint, yet R. Reagan's government seeks an increase in military appropriations and demands more and more new weapons, more and more sophisticated military technologies. Of course, from the viewpoint of common sense, there is no logic. There is not and cannot be a reasonable alternative to peaceful coexistence between states. Let us stress no reasonable alternative, but, unfortunately, the unreasonable alternatives are legion. They have their own logic, a logic alien to common sense.

Breaking the backbone of the arms race means cutting the ground from under militarism. If there are fewer weapons in the world, there will be less hostility. It will be necessary, willy-nilly, to seek the resolution of interstate problems on the basis of cooperation, true equality, and respect for the legitimate interests of all members of the international community. You cannot achieve everything all at once, so, to begin with, stop the further buildup of military arsenals and do not take military rivalry into a sphere where it does not yet exist. Logical? From the viewpoint of strengthening security for all states and on all continents, it is logical. But from the imperial standpoint, from where the U.S. rulers look down on their surroundings, it does not stand up to criticism.

"Security and peace," R. Reagan stated at a recent meeting with businessmen, "cannot be obtained free. They are very precious things, and like everything of great value, it



is necessary to pay a certain price for them..." In this specific instance, the President was talking a language which his audience understood: money and trade. If you want to go on exploiting your own people and others, you'll have to look sharp. Big business will be supplied for years to come with government orders with guaranteed profits. P. Nitze, the administration's special adviser on arms control questions, has no hesitation in promising "decades" of a very high pace of "modernization" of American strategic doctrines and, naturally, of the entire war machine. He knows what he is talking about.

True, there are some problems. It is in no way possible to reconcile demands with potential. In 1984 the state debt increased by a further sum of nearly \$200 billion, and the foreign trade deficit doubled, amounting to \$101 billion. You will soon go bankrupt that way.

It will be necessary, R. Reagan warned, to cut "domestic spending," by which he means, first and foremost, appropriation for social security, education and medicine. He admitted that this will be "politically a most difficult act." Too true. Whichever way you look at it, however you juggle with the statistics--for instance, for the military items the administration shows "real growth" (corrected to allow for inflation), while the social spending it gives the "absolute level" at current prices--as a result of the Republicans' 4-year campaign against the deprived strata of the population, the sick, and the old, the army of superfluous people in the United States has grown to record levels. Someone with an empty belly takes a different view of the "national interest" from someone with a full belly, and the nuclear umbrella has yet to provide anyone with a substitute for a roof over their head.

Naturally, American senators and congressmen do not have the concerns which torment the unemployed and those who eat at soup kitchens, but they too have begun to doubt whether it is right, in struggling against the dangers created by a sick imagination, to bring down real threats on the country. Would it not be better to concern yourself with domestic affairs, which there are plenty of, and to use the chance offered by the Geneva talks not for idle talk, but to elaborate mutually acceptable settlements. An antiwar movement is worse than any armed rebellion. It must be suppressed without delay. So all the President's men, headed by R. Reagan, went into the attack on the Capitol. The first deafening salvo was against the senators. It was fired by the MX first-strike missiles, and 55 out of 100 senators decided to satisfy the administration's demands.

The White House rubs its hands in satisfaction. It is almost sure that the House of Representatives will not withstand the onslaught either, that the majority will not want to be labeled "traitors to national security." It, like the Senate, is being besieged with "arguments": the refusal to allocate \$1.5 billion for the production of another 21 MX missiles would weaken national defense; render useless all the billions of dollars of earlier expenditure; undermine the positions of America's allies who have agreed to receive the new Pershing and cruise missiles on their territory; and undermine the positions of the American representatives at the Geneva talks by showing the Russians that the majority of members of the U.S. Congress still lack resolve.

I have repeated the President's arguments word for word. They were reproduced in the same form by Vice President G. Bush. In order to bring pressure to

bear on the members of Congress, M. Kampelman and J. Tower, who head the American delegation to Geneva, were called in. The impression is that they have recently been concerned mainly with their customary work of pushing through military programs.

"For the sake of peace throughout the world," as R. Reagan claimed. In fact, this phrase is all that remains of Reagan's peace-loving fireworks which were so widely advertised with an eye to the elections last year.

Thus, the Congress vote on MX missiles was a kind of touchstone for the whole U.S. military policy, a test of the potential for "taking to their conclusion," as R. Reagan noted at a 19 March meeting with a group of Republican senators, "the carefully elaborated plans for strengthening national defense." It was enough, the President stated, that "in the last 4 years defense spending was cut by more than \$150 billion." Hardly had the stunned listeners had time to rub their eyes, when the speaker explained—cut relatively, compared with "the level laid down in the 5-year plan in 1981" by him, R. Reagan.

At a time when Soviet-American talks are under way, nobody in Washington has the right to state that the United States has no choice, that an evil fate is forcing it to think in terms of confrontation. No, the Americans seek complications wherever they can, and where, for all their efforts, they cannot find them, they create them.

Former U.S. Secretary of State A. Haig last week published a curious article in THE WASHINGTON POST in which, among other things, he says: "We set new restrictions on the use of force by the Soviet Union and extended the horizons of security for free peoples and peoples fighting for freedom." Let us pin down these concepts of "freedom" and so forth, let us look at the crux of the matter. A. Haig is in retirement. He does not have to choose diplomatic phrases. He can be frank. The United States has decided to curtail the positions and interests of the USSR and its friends. Washington is ripe for an expansion of its "Lebensraum," its spheres of influence, the fields for investment of capital—call it what you like. And that does not just happen of its own accord. Such an "extension of the horizons of security" really cannot be obtained free and with no risk.

Strange coincidences happen in life. Amid the thunder of the battles for the MX missiles and the administration's militarist programs in general, one event which could have immense consequences for the development of the United States went almost unnoticed. At this very time the country's Supreme Court decided by seven votes to two that the law adopted after the "Watergate scandal" limiting the size of contributions by political action committees to the funds for presidential campaigns, that is, for buying votes, is a violation of "freedom of speech." Justice White tried without success to persuade his colleagues that the "right to speak" is not the same as the "right to spend money." Far from it.

In other, unfree countries, perhaps. But not in the "free" United States, where everything is money—time, speech, oaths, freedom itself. Restrictions cannot

9 May 1985

be brooked. Everyone has his cross to bear. Let the poor man seek work, and the rich man a use for his capital. That is how they decide. Ultimately, Congress, the Supreme Court, and the administration are institutions in the same social system. They express the interests of the same class and preach the same social religion.

#### House Debate Opens

LD261503 Moscow TASS in English 1445 GMT 26 Mar 85

[Text] Washington March 26 TASS—TASS correspondent Aleksandr Lyutyy reports:

The House of Representatives of U.S. Congress has begun a debate on the Reagan administration's request for the allocation of 1,500 million dollars in the current financial year for the construction of another 21 MX first-strike inter-continental ballistic missiles in addition to the same number of missiles which are already in production.

As has already been reported, the U.S. Senate under the most strong pressure of the White House complied with the request of the administration which has now switched over to a massive manipulation of the House of Representatives where the first voting on MX programme is to be held today. President Reagan has urgently recalled Max Kampelman, the leader of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear space arms, from Geneva to Washington.

The delegation leader has set about actively "twisting the arms" of the lawmakers by holding a series of meetings with members of the House of Representatives on the Capitol Hill and then in the White House where Reagan himself joined him. In an attempt to include hesitant lawmakers into supporting the MX programme, Kampelman put forward one absurd thesis after another. According to him, progress at the Geneva talks is ostensibly practically impossible without the MX programme and that the way to reduction of arms lies through...their build-up. Such statements are an overt mockery of common sense and logic. The allusion to the talks of Geneva is being cynically used by the administration for a propagandist cover-up for a continuation of the nuclear arms race.

This is precisely what has been pointed out by many participants in the debate in the House of Representatives. Congressman Edward Markey has stated that the fact that the leader of the U.S. delegation was recalled from the talks solely for the purpose of "pushing" the MX programme through is indicative of the administration's true attitude to the problem of limiting and reducing arms. He pointed out that Kampelman misses the important talks for the sake of advocating an increase in the number of the missiles. This tells a tale. The Geneva talks are being used as a trump card in an attempt to secure an approval of the programme which will cost the U.S. taxpayers 41,000 million dollars, will weaken U.S. security, and undermine stability in the world.

Congressman Parren Mitchell has described the MX programme as dangerous, costly and senseless. The allocation of funds for a continuation of the MX programme now that the U.S. Soviet talks are being held in Geneva will jeopardize progress at the talks. John Bryant, member of the House of Representatives, has stressed that he is convinced that the USA does not need MX missiles.

### Kampelman Role Criticized

PM261649 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Mar 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "To Step Up Pressure"]

[Text] Washington, 25 Mar--The White House has announced that M. Kampelman, head of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space armaments under way in Geneva, has been urgently called to Washington. It is clear from the report that he is to take part in bringing vigorous influence to bear on U.S. Congressmen to make them vote for appropriations for the production of a further 21 MX ICBM's.

The Senate has already decided to satisfy the administration's request for \$1.5 billion in the 1985 fiscal budget for the construction of a new batch of MX missiles in addition to the 21 similar missiles already in production designed to deliver a first strike. People here are noting that the administration has succeeded in gaining support for its militarist program primarily with the aid of an unprecedented campaign to pressure Congress.

In the days preceding the Senate vote, R. Reagan brought intensive pressure to bear on the legislators to make them approve the Pentagon request. The President personally tried to persuade each senator that the continuation of the MX program is a matter of exceptional importance. All the leading figures of the administration, including Vice President G. Bush and Secretary of State G. Shultz, took part in indoctrinating the senators and congressmen. In the last days before the vote, they essentially did not leave Congress, trying to influence the legislators in the direction Reagan wants. After the Senate had expressed itself in favor of earmarking funds for the MX program by 55 votes to 45, the administration switched to indoctrinating the members of the House of Representatives, where a vote is now to take place.

At a routine (ocherednyaya) press conference, journalists asked the White House deputy press secretary the reasons for M. Kampelman's urgent departure for Washington. The reply was strange and came down to the claim that the MX program's passage through Congress and its approval would help to advance the Geneva talks.

The reference to the Geneva talks is being used here as blatant propaganda cover for the continuation of the escalation of the nuclear arms race -- that is the only way this statement can be assessed. It is noteworthy that the U.S. press frankly states that Kampelman in this case, like other members of the administration, is assigned the role of overt fixers for the program that essentially contradicts the aims and tasks of the Geneva talks.

Kampelman's call to Washington has perplexed congressional circles, which are emphasizing how grossly the U.S. administration is exploiting the Geneva talks to push through appropriations for MX missiles and other military programs. House Speaker T. O'Neill has stated that the President has failed to put forward convincing justifications on the military or diplomatic plane for the expenditure on the MX missiles, which will total \$41 billion. This missile has greater destructive power than all the explosive devices used during World War II taken together. The 200 MX missiles will add to the U.S. arsenal the destructive force of 200 World War II's, but all this might and all the accuracy of the MX missiles will not enhance U.S. security, because this might has an inherent flaw: It is as vulnerable as it is mortally destructive.



Touching on the argument of the administration and the supporters of the MX in Congress to the effect that the MX can be used as a "bargaining counter" in Geneva, T. O'Neill said: "If the MX missile cannot fulfill its military function, it has only a dubious chance of fulfilling its diplomatic mission. If this missile is vulnerable in the event of attack, it will be of dubious value as a 'bargaining counter.'"

#### Reagan Thanks Congressmen

LD270643 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0450 GMT 27 Mar 85

[Text] Washington, 27 Mar (TASS) -- The White House wasted no time in expressing its satisfaction with the fact that the House of Representatives, under unprecedented pressure from the administration, voted in support of the program to produce MX strategic nuclear missiles.

In a special statement, President Reagan expressed his gratitude to those who, in his words, are "facilitating efforts, aimed at modernizing the strategic nuclear potential" of the United States.

Against this backdrop, the White House leader's claims that the vote "is a voice for peace, for success" at the Geneva talks, are, to say the least, illogical. As we well know, these talks aim to put a stop to the arms race, not in any way to step it up. Reagan's statement that the administration is willing "to do everything to bring about a significant reduction in arms," sounds equally demagogic and insincere.

Having "thanked" the congressmen, the President immediately reminded them, that, in accordance with set procedure, the House of Representatives this week faces one more and the deciding round of voting on fund allocation for MX missile production.

#### Reagan Statements 'Demagogic, Insincere'

OW271321 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1100 GMT 27 Mar 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Fesunenکو]

[Text] The House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress has, after all, sanctioned continuation of the production of first-strike MX intercontinental missiles. Yesterday, with 219 votes against 213, it approved the allocation of \$1.5 billion this financial year for the production of another 21 missiles of this kind.

As was known last week, the Senate also approved the allocation of these funds. The voting in the House of Representatives, the results of which were not announced until the very last minute, was preceded by the most intensive White House lobbying of the lawmakers. The President and other administration leaders personally called wavering congressmen, applying carrot-and-stick tactics and occasionally even making frank threats.

As our press has already reported, even Max Kampelman, head of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms, was urgently recalled from Geneva on Reagan's instructions. During the past 2 days, together with the President, he lobbied the lawmakers with the mendacious thesis that continuation of the MX program will, supposedly, promote the success of the Geneva talks.



As soon as the results of voting became known, President Reagan expressed gratitude to those who, as he said, helped efforts aimed at modernization of the U.S. strategic nuclear potential. In connection with this, the assertion of the White House chief that the result of yesterday's voting was, supposedly, a vote for peace and a vote for success at the Geneva talks -- aimed at ending the arms race, as is known, and not at accelerating it -- is surprising, to say the least.

Reagan's remarks about the administration being supposedly ready to do everything to ensure a significant reduction of arms sounded just as demagogic and insincere.

Having thanked, in quotes, the congressmen, the President hastened to remind them that, according to established procedure, another decisive round of voting on the allocation of funds for the production of MX missiles will be held this week in the House of Representatives.

CSO: 5200/1050

SALT/START ISSUES

BRIEFS

U.S.-USSR STANDING CONSULTATIVE COMMISSION MEETS--Geneva April 10 TASS--A regular session opened here today of the Soviet-American Standing Consultative Commission, set up to facilitate the implementation of the objectives and provisions of the treaty limiting anti-missile defence systems and the interim agreement on some measures in the field of restricting strategic offensive armaments, concluded between the USSR and the United States on May 26 1972, as well as the agreement on measures for reducing the risk of an outbreak of nuclear war, concluded between the two countries on September 30 1971. [Text] [LD101725 Moscow TASS in English 1711 GMT 10 Apr 85]

CSO: 5200/1092

9 May 1985

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

## GORBACHEV LETTER OF REPLY TO FRG PEACE ACTIVISTS

LD281152 Moscow TASS in English 1141 GMT 28 Mar 85

[Text] Bonn March 28 TASS--A delegation of the Peace Council of the West German city of Heilbronn (Baden-Wuerttemberg Land) visited a few days ago the Embassy of the USSR in Bonn and forwarded an address to the Soviet leadership, expressing concern, on behalf of the city residents, over the continued arms race and the deployment of American first-strike nuclear missile systems in the FRG. Earlier, a peace march from Heilbronn to Bonn had been held at the initiative of anti-war organizations of the city to demand the removal of American Pershing-2 missiles from West German territory.

In this connection they recalled the alarming incident at the American military base Waldheide near Heilbronn where a spontaneous Pershing-2 missile launch took place. As a result of the explosion of the missile several people died or were badly injured. It was only by sheer luck that the incident did not entail truly disastrous consequences.

The Soviet Ambassador to the FRG Vladimir Semenov received today representatives of the Peace Council of Heilbronn and handed them a reply of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev. It says:

I have received your letter. I fully share your concern over the threat to peace with which the present international situation is fraught.

Indeed, we are living through an extremely complicated period of time. Contrary to the will of the peoples who want peace, the arms race is stepping up its tempo and now threatens to spread to space.

The Soviet-American talks which have begun in Geneva have given rise to many hopes. As for the Soviet Union, I can assure you firmly that we are sincerely interested in the successful outcome of these talks and shall work persistently for them to yield positive results that would take into account the legitimate interests of both sides.

It must be noted, however, that things accompanying the beginning of the talks cannot but put one on guard. Already now, with the talks started, one gets the impression from statements by high-ranking representatives of the USA that they need talks as a screen for carrying through their military programmes. Appropriations of billions of dollars are being pushed through for the manufacture of new batches of first-strike

MX missiles; they are trying to prove to the whole world what cannot be proved, namely that the militarization of space is a boon. In Belgium, American cruise missiles are being installed contrary to the will of the overwhelming majority of the population.

You are right when you say that the peoples of our two countries can do much to remove the threat of world war. But this threat will grow, and not diminish, if the deployment of American first-strike nuclear missile systems is continued, in the first place, in the territory of the FRG. Soviet people see with concern that a war danger for them is coming again from German soil. Meantime it would be logical to ask: With the talks in Geneva started, why to [as received] deploy ever new nuclear weapons in Europe, thus compelling the Soviet Union, too, to take measures in response? Had it not been for this factor there would have been no cause for concern of which you write with such emotion, as you are worried also about the fate of your Heilbronn, too.

I agree with you concerning the importance of ties between the Soviet Union and the FRG. People in our country are convinced that our people and the cause of world peace will only benefit from cooperation and goodneighbourly relations between the USSR and the FRG. And don't you believe those who maliciously allege that we are using the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism for fanning up anti-German sentiments. We are internationalists and we stand for friendship between the peoples. But we will continue to display vigilance with regard to those in the West who by their talk of "reconciliation" cover up their support for revanchist designs.

With best wishes to you and the entire Peace Council of Heilbronn in your noble activities in the name of removing the threat of war.

Mikhail Gorbachev.

Ruth Coors, representative of the People Council of Heilbronn, expressed cordial gratitude to Mikhail Gorbachev for his reply and warm wishes.

CSO: 5200/1056

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

### U.S. REACTIONS TO SS-20 DEPLOYMENT MORATORIUM NOTED

#### U.S. Answer 'Hasty,' 'Strange'

LD081714 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 8 Apr 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Fesunenکو]

[Text] Official Washington, it became known today, was in a hurry to give a negative reply to the USSR new peace initiatives. Larry Speakes, deputy press secretary of the White House, stated that the Soviet Union's introduction of a unilateral moratorium on on deploying its medium-range missiles until November this year, and the suspension of other responsive measures in Europe will not, in his words, influence plans for deploying U.S. Pershing II and cruise missiles in the countries of West Europe.

The reply, you should agree with me, is categorical and rather explicit. It does not need commentaries but, all the same, I will say that the categorical and hasty nature of it in such important international affairs, is, to say the least, strange.

#### Congressmen Urge U.S. Moratorium

LD091017 Moscow TASS in English 1001 GMT 9 Apr 85

[Text] Washington April 9 TASS -- TASS correspondent Aleksandr Lyutyy reports:

Thirty-eight members of the U.S. House of Representatives have addressed a letter to the U.S. President urging him to introduce for the period of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva a moratorium on testing and deploying nuclear and space weapons. The letter demands that the President conclude a bilateral agreement aimed at ending further tests and deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons, of strategic and space weapons and also at terminating underground nuclear tests pending a successful completion of the talks. The congressmen expressed concern about the continuing arms race, and stressed in their letter that its escalation will be in conflict with the aims of the Geneva talks and undermine the conclusion of a treaty. Our proposal, the letter says, gives the best chance for success of the Soviet-American dialogue.



9 May 1985

## Official Washington

LD091753 Moscow TASS in English 1738 GMT 9 Apr 85

[Text] Geneva April 9 TASS -- TASS special correspondent Vladimir Bogachev reports:

The Soviet Union's decision to introduce a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and to halt the other measures taken by it in Europe in response to U.S. missile deployments are viewed by journalists in Geneva as another manifestation of the Soviet Union's goodwill and its firm resolve to make sensible compromises for the sake of progress at the talks with the USA on nuclear and space weapons.

In view of the Soviet Union's latest peace initiative, attention is again attached here to the fact that during the past four years the United States has not taken a single practical step which could be viewed as a follow-up to public statements of spokesmen for the administration about its desire "to exclude nuclear weapons from human life."

While the Soviet Union's basic position is first to put a brake on the arms race and immediately to go over to arms reductions, the United States has come up with the absurd idea that the only sound way to arms reductions goes through an advance arms build-up by the United States. Moreover, while Washington spokesmen give deadlines for the deployment of their new nuclear weapons, they never say when and how they are going to reduce those weapons in accordance with their absurd idea. Washington responded to the Soviet decision to introduce a moratorium on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe by feeding the press controversial and ambiguous data about the Soviet Union's "immense superiority" in medium-range missiles in Europe.

The United States refuses to follow the Soviet Union's example and is not going to introduce a moratorium either on tests of anti-satellite systems or on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe. THE NEW YORK TIMES reports that the United States also rejected at the Geneva talks the Soviet proposal on a mutual freeze on strategic nuclear systems because of the need to continue the deployment of MX missiles.

Washington tries to create the impression that the Soviet Union's unilateral measures to limit its armaments may bring to a head political differences between the two sides within the next few months while the adoption by the USA of programmes to build up its strategic armaments and medium-range systems will, allegedly, contribute to the progress of the Geneva talks.

"In the course of the 1984 election campaign President Reagan kept saying that he would make arms control problem number one for his administration," a local veteran journalist remarked. "Now one is getting the impression that Reagan would like to go down in history as 'President No.' Indeed, he has not yet given a positive response to any of the Russians' unilateral arms limitation measures."

McFarlane's NBC Interview

LD100909 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0230 GMT 10 Apr 85

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Georgiy Alekseyev]

[Text] Official Washington has voiced a negative attitude towards the Soviet initiative. An interview was held by NBC TV with the President's National Security Adviser McFarlane in just such a spirit. He alleged that the initiative is a repetition of a proposal made previously. Such a stance so contradicts the obvious facts that a direct question was put to McFarlane: Why do you think that it is not serious, for the USSR has proposed the immediate introduction of a moratorium for a period of at least 6 months? It has not demanded that NATO should halt its deployment during these 6 months. In reply McFarlane was unable to say anything convincing. In this connection it is noted that by its rejection of the proposal of the Soviet leader, the White House is letting slip yet another change of containing the arms race.

Senator Hart

LD091735 Moscow TASS in English 1701 GMT 9 Apr 85

[Text] Washington April 9 TASS -- By turning down the proposal of the Soviet leader on introducing a moratorium on the stationing of intermediate-range missiles in Europe, the United States Administration is making a grave mistake, said Senator Gary Hart. In doing so, the White House blasts another chance of slowing down the arms race, while the introduction of a moratorium would have been a major step toward its termination. A moratorium on the deployment and testing of all nuclear weapons, including anti-satellite systems, Gary Hart went on to say, would have been a demonstration of restraint which would give Soviet and U.S. negotiators at Geneva a good opportunity for a really constructive dialogue.

U.S., Foreign Mass Media

PM091253 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Apr 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS roundup: "USSR's Goodwill"]

[Text] 8 Apr -- The foreign mass media and eminent politicians and public figures in various countries are assessing M.S. Gorbachev's talk with the editor of PRAVDA as a convincing demonstration of the Soviet Union's goodwill, its sincere desire for honest dialogue, and a search for realistic decisions that would ease world tension and help bar the way to the arms race. Numerous commentaries note that the existing opportunities for improving Soviet-U.S. relations and normalizing the overall international situation must not be missed.

Special emphasis is placed on the exceptional importance and topicality of the new initiative of the Soviet Union, which has proposed that the USSR and the United States introduce for the entire period of the arms reduction talks a moratorium on the creation of strike space weapons, including scientific research work and testing and deployment, and that they freeze their strategic offensive armaments. It is pointed out that in introducing a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and suspending the implementation of other responsive measures in Europe, the USSR has demonstrated its goodwill -- its desire for peace and the curbing of the arms race.

M.S. Gorbachev's assessment of the present complex international situation and of Soviet-U.S. relations is the focus of attention of the U.S. mass media. The Soviet leader's talk, NBC television reports, is evidence of the USSR's positive attitude toward a summit meeting. "The Soviet Union advocates frank, honest dialogue, urging the United States to act in such a way as to show the whole world that the two powers are oriented not toward hostility but toward the search for mutual understanding and the development of relations," CBS television notes. The Soviet leadership does not believe that confrontation is almost a natural state engendered by defective relations between Moscow and Washington, THE NEW YORK TIMES writes. The newspaper emphasizes that the Soviet Union's introduction of a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and the suspension of the implementation of other responsive measures in Europe is designed to lend impetus to the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations.

P. Warnke, former head of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks, has noted that the Soviet decision is a manifestation of the readiness to take definite steps to improve the present international climate.

It has been announced in Washington that the content of M.S. Gorbachev's talk has been brought to the attention of President R. Reagan, who is on vacation, by R. McFarlane, the President's national security adviser. During the subsequent press conference White House spokesman Speakes said: "We are studying the statements of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and giving them every attention." At the same time, reiterating the unfounded allegations concerning the USSR's "superiority" in the terms of medium-range weapons in Europe, Speakes made it clear that the U.S. Administration does not intend to follow the Soviet Union's example and suspend the deployment of its own medium-range missiles in Europe. The Soviet Union's introduction of a moratorium, he said, "will not be reflected in U.S. plans to deploy Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe, which will be continued." The U.S. Administration has thus confirmed that although it has sat down at the conference table for arms reduction talks, it is in fact leading matters to the further buildup of arms.

The British newspaper THE TIMES calls the Soviet Union's decision to introduce a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles in Europe an "important goodwill gesture." M.S. Gorbachev's statements, the newspaper writes, have been assessed highly in Britain, whose government is actively seeking ways of improving East-West relations. THE DAILY TELEGRAPH notes the consistency of the Soviet policy on questions of reducing nuclear arsenals. "Moscow has openly urged the White House to follow the Soviet Union's example and halt the deployment of missiles in Europe," the DAILY EXPRESS writes.

The British Government, D. Steele, leader of Britain's Liberal Party, has stated, must urge the U.S. President to respond positively to the Soviet proposal. We must seek the speediest reciprocal freeze on any further missile deployment, which would be a good impetus to the Geneva talks.

French television points to the principled nature of the USSR's stance on fundamental foreign policy issues. Noting the exceptionally important and topical nature of the new Soviet initiatives and the fact that, by introducing a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles, the USSR has demonstrated goodwill and its determination to defend peace, an ANTENNE-2 television commentator stresses that it is now up to the United States, which is continuing to deploy its Pershing II and cruise missiles in West Europe. The French newspaper LIBERATION writes that, by continuing to deploy first-strike nuclear weapons in Europe, the White House is in fact demonstrating its reluctance to conduct negotiations in earnest.

The moratorium announced by Moscow, Portuguese radio reports, is new confirmation of Moscow's firm desire to strengthen security on our continent and throughout the world. This important goodwill gesture is generating approval among the international public which, considering that it is time Washington moved from words to deeds in questions of limiting the arms race, is waiting for a positive response to the Soviet initiative.

Japan's KYODO news agency notes that the USSR is continuing and building up the peace offensive, stressing in particular that the Soviet Union's decision to introduce a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe displays the flexibility of the Soviet stance and is meeting with the understanding and support of the international public.

The Soviet Union's new peace initiatives are a convincing demonstration of the USSR's goodwill and readiness to transfer existing opportunities for improving Soviet-U.S. relations and normalizing the overall international atmosphere to the plane of specific policy and practical decisions, the Bulgarian newspaper RABOTNICHESKO DELO writes. The newspaper stresses that the policy of peaceful coexistence that the Soviet Union and the socialist community countries are actively pursuing presupposes that it is by force of example not weapon that must be used to prove which is the better of the two systems.

CSO: 5200/1085

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

### BBC REPORT OF SS-20 DEPLOYMENTS IN GDR DENIED

PM101015 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Apr 85 Second Edition p 3

[V. Pustov "Rejoinder": "BBC Fables"]

[Text] Lies, they say, are short-lived. Perhaps that is true, but they also say that rumor fills the earth. That is what various kinds of anti-Soviets gamble on. Their intention is as perfidious as it is primitive; the most important thing is to start an anti-Soviet fable, and then, as Don Basilio, Beaumarchais' specialist in slander, taught, "devilry is abroad in the world."

This was the outcome which the radio falsifiers from the British BBC were counting on when they unhesitatingly started to assert that Soviet missiles, known in the West as SS-20's, are being deployed on GDR territory. That is a malicious lie. There were and are no such missiles on the territory of the GDR, or of our other allies. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA reported at one time that as one of the Soviet Union's countermeasures to the siting of American Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe, by agreement with the governments of the GDR and the CSSR, the siting of enhanced-range operational-tactical missiles had begun on those countries' territory. The purpose of this action is common knowledge -- to be ready to give a fitting rebuff to an aggressor if he dares to encroach on the security of our motherland and our allies and friends. However, these are quite different missiles; the Soviet medium-range missiles which the BBC is spreading false information about are only on the Soviet Union's territory.

Moreover, in order to stop the arms race and embark immediately on arms reduction, the USSR has once again convincingly demonstrated its good will. As M.S. Gorbachev stated in a talk with the editor of PRAVDA, the Soviet Union is introducing a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and halting the implementation of other countermeasures in Europe. The moratorium is to last until November of this year. Our country's decision after that will depend on whether the United States follows our example, or whether it stops the deployment of its own medium-range missiles in Europe.

The anti-Soviet falsehood released by the British television company can only have a purpose directly opposed to the reduction of armaments, including nuclear armaments, and the lessening of tension in the world.

CSO: 5200/1083



## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

### TINDEMANS DEFENDS INF DEPLOYMENT, VIEWS DUTCH POSITION

Amsterdam ELSEVIERS WEEKBLAD in Dutch 30 Mar 85 pp 29-31

[Interview by ELSEVIERS WEEKBLAD with Belgian Foreign Minister Leo Tindemans by Pieter Nouwen: "I Just Want To Say That It Was Not As Arbitrary As Some People Thought"; date or place not given]

[Text] For 3 months Belgium has been in the news on account of the question of whether or not its government would, on 15 March, proceed with the deployment of the first cruise missiles.

The government, made up of Liberals and Christian Democrats, wanted to so, but there was opposition to it from some of the party leaders of the Christian Democrats; this opposition is something that the party of Wilfried Martens and his minister of foreign affairs, Leo Tindemans, may well be able to remove during the next parliamentary elections.

They considered their task to be to attempt to fulfill their obligations to the Atlantic Alliance and at the same time keep their Christian People's Party (CVP) together, and they seem to have succeeded for the moment. To do this, however, they had to work long and hard and, according to some people, they had to do some finagling as well.

First there was the confusion as to who had actually signed the NATO deployment plan in 1979 and how it happened. Then there were the "offensive" against deployment which was being conducted by dissidents within the CVP headed by faction leader Van den Brande and the threat of a cabinet crisis raised by the Liberal coalition members if deployment did not proceed. Then there were meetings between Tindemans and a number of colleagues within NATO, among whom Minister Van den Broek said also said that Belgium must proceed with deployment. This was viewed as hypocritical in some quarters in view of the separate position which Holland itself was taking on the issue.

The Belgian Government undertook one more initiative: Minister Tindemans was in Moscow to attend Chernenko's funeral and took the opportunity to ask his counterpart Gromyko for a "gesture" to help the government solve its problems and possibly to aid the negotiations in Geneva. When this advance evoked a "no" from Gromyko, Brussels decided to proceed with deployment immediately. The missiles were on the way to Florennes before parliament was even informed of the decision.

The results: large protest demonstrations in Brussels, doubts cast on the quality of Belgium's democracy in the international press and, last week, a marathon night debate in parliament, which the government survived by a margin of 23 votes.

[Question] "Mr Tindemans, in Moscow you asked Mr Gromyko for a gesture. If the Soviet Union were willing to unlink the three items being negotiated in Geneva (strategic weapons, "Star Wars" and the European intermediate-range missiles [INF], then Belgium would postpone its decision on cruise missiles. What were you expecting from that initiative? Did it have any chance of success?"

[Answer] "I was very relaxed and open-minded about it. What was the issue? I would like to set the record straight on one point. A number of people and organizations in Belgium were harboring the hope that, by making a gesture to the Soviet Union, it would be possible to get the Soviets to make a gesture in return and thus to give the negotiations in Geneva a better chance."

"The American chief negotiator, Kampelman, had informed us that the Americans might be willing to reach and implement an accord separately on the three issues which you mentioned but that the Soviets were known to be insisting that an agreement had to be reached on the whole package before any of its points could be implemented. The Soviet Union's answer on that point was not entirely clear: even the Americans' statement indicated some doubt as to the Soviets' answer. Thus it seemed appropriate to offer the Soviets a brief postponement (of from 3 to 6 months) of the deployment of the missiles in Belgium while asking the question: Are you then willing to do something if an agreement is reached about the missiles?

"Now, you may have your doubts whether it was a wise idea to make a special demarche to Moscow in this connection. Some people were for it, some against it, in this sense: what kind of an impression does it make if Western democracies go to Moscow to ask: 'What do you think of this?', while the Soviet Union is proceeding with its deployment. But then Chernenko died and we had to go to the funeral, and thus there was no longer any question of going or not going."

Minister Tindemans explains that it was decided that he should go to Moscow rather than the prime minister in order to avoid interfering with his official duties in Belgium. This decision was the prime minister's. "We wanted to go to parliament, that was announced, but 15 March was more than just a symbolic date," but the government program had not been updated and the political situation in the country might change, and thus it was decided that the minister of foreign affairs should go.

Unthinkable

"Then on Thursday I had a talk with Gromyko that lasted 45 minutes. The question was this: Is it true what the Americans say, that as far as the Soviet Union is concerned the three issues must be resolved together, or else

there will be no agreement? Would it not be possible to remove the INF from the package and to try to find a solution that way? Then it would be more reasonable for us to argue for a postponement: if it could be assumed that an agreement would be reached during this interval.

"Gromyko's answer: 'No. That is unthinkable as far as we are concerned, because we have just come back because the problems have become global [as published]. As far as we are concerned, the INF weapons are strategic weapons,' he said, 'as soon as they can reach our territory. Thus it is unthinkable to separate them from the talks on strategic nuclear weapons.' Then I said: 'But we are against the arms race and against having such things on our soil. During the famous "walk in the woods," a solution was so close, is it now unthinkable to conduct intensive talks on that basis in a short period of time in order to reach an agreement within 3 months? Then this problem would be out of the way.' Then he said: 'You are giving the American version of the facts. We are not that close in our positions. Quite the contrary, in fact. We covered a lot of ground there.' And then he said, and I quote: 'But we were not close to an agreement.'

"Now we had a definitive statement, and we knew what the Soviet Union's position was. I reported this to the government, and that did affect the decision. In addition, our allies were also interested in the answer that Belgium had gotten."

[Question] "Has the Belgian Government made any previous, unannounced efforts to persuade the USSR to make a gesture?"

In response to this question, Tindemans cited the extensive initiatives which he had undertaken in Eastern Europe and the talks, some of them long, which he had had with Gromyko to make it clear that as far as he was concerned, all options were conceivable but that, without an agreement, Belgium would have to fulfill its commitment to deploy.

[Question] "At a certain point Minister Van den Broek made it clear to the Belgian Government: 'You must deploy'. Some people found this strange in view of the separate position which Holland is taking within NATO. How do you view the role of the Dutch Government?"

[Answer] "The relations between the two governments are very good. The relations between Premier Lubbers and our prime minister and those between Mr Van den Broek and myself are very friendly, and we have more than once had occasion to talk over this issue informally. At one point Minister Van den Broek made a statement for Belgian television in which he made it clear that Holland's pledge in 1979 was not the same as Belgium's. There is a difference in commitment. Second, people pointed to the nuclear tasks which Holland is performing and which are not the same as those of Belgium. Third, Holland has still been able to reach an agreement even after all the domestic problems that there have been. In view of all the difficulties that Holland has had in keeping the

government's majority, its position was an understandable one. When Minister Van den Broek made the statement, it was not at odds with the Dutch position. I believe that the Dutch Government is studying this issue again because it has been reported that the Soviet Union is still going forward with its deployment; according to the latest reports, 11 missiles are now supposed to have arrived."

[Question] "In this regard the verification problem is again playing a role in Dutch politics. What is your view?"

[Answer] "That is, of course, the crucial problem. When we talk about numbers, how can we check them? Here we are relying on American sources and the evidence being provided by them."

[Question] "As far as the Belgian Government is concerned, is that sufficient?"

[Answer] "That is a difficult question. For one thing: we have no reason to doubt the information, and for another, of course, as good students of historical criticism, we consider it appropriate to examine how reliable the data are. I do not believe, by the way, that the United States has any interest in distributing biased data. Such things always come out afterwards and can only impair mutual confidence rather than strengthening it."

[Question] "Going back to the relations with Holland: Minister Van den Broek's remarks thus did not come as a surprise to you."

[Answer] "Let us make a distinction here. We had, of course, had various talks, as I mentioned, both with Mr Lubbers and with Mr Van den Broek. But the thing that was noteworthy was Mr Van den Broek's emphatic statement. The belief in the commitments that have been made, making sure that there would be no cracks in the alliance and the fact that this position was stated so clearly by a Dutch minister (and for Belgium as well): That was well worth the trouble." (At this point the minister looks at the interviewer very intently.)

[Question] "Do you expect that the Belgian decision will have a positive effect on Holland's position, that is, positive from the standpoint of the alliance?"

[Answer] "I want to be extremely cautious here because every word that I say may have political implications in Holland," says Tindemans. To his mind, the Dutch Government's attitude toward the original alliance is to be ascribed to the fact that the government wanted to retain its majority, but there was no mention of a change in the basic view. And: "It is possible that the arguments that were presented during the recent debate here in Belgium may also be repeated in Holland soon."

"What is for me the most significant argument in favor of the decision that we have just made pertains to the future role of the small partners in the alliance. My great fear is that if no small country participates, we will no longer have any voice in the alliance and the larger NATO countries will make all the major decisions among themselves alone. This is in contrast to the present situation where we are often listened to and our input is important."

The minister points out the role played by the Harmel Report and the Washington Declaration in the Eurogroup. But if the small countries do not live up to their commitments, then there exists the danger that the United States, Great Britain, and Italy on the one hand and France and West Germany on the other will drift further apart. "What will become of our influence then?"

"Second, there are those who think that the Europeans must do more as regards their own security. In principle, I agree with this view," and then Tindemans points to the Belgian role in the revival of the Western European Union and the fact that it was the countries wanting to set up the European Defense Community plus England which were the most insistent in urging Belgium to live up to its commitment. And assuming that more should be done for European defense in a similar, but informal connection and that this leads to the conclusion that the cruise missiles must be deployed, "then should we do so without protesting? I never got an answer to that."

[Question] "In the international press there has been a great deal of criticism of the manner and the timing of your government's informing of the public and parliament of the deployment decision. Was this something that could not be avoided? Could it not have been done some other way?"

[Answer] "It might well have been, but what the international press did not see was what our constitution states in this regard. We had three debates on this topic: in November 1983 in the Chamber, in December 1983 in the Senate and, 3 weeks ago, another one in the Chamber. Should we first go to parliament to get authorization there for the deployment of the missiles? Or can the government decide first and then report to parliament? We talked to specialists in constitutional law on this topic, and indeed our Constitution does state that the King concludes peace, declares war, and so forth. This means that as regards essential decisions on matters pertaining to national defense, it is the executive (the king, i.e., the government) that decides. Therefore, the government can notify parliament, and parliament can then approve or disapprove of what the government has done."

"Then there is another aspect: if we have no concluded accords with the Americans for the base in Florennes, what is the legal status of the Americans there and of the base? There is thus the current theory here that parliament is to be notified of this to the extent that national security permits. And, a later government may come along and reverse the decision. Right away you see the difference [between us and] Holland, where the matter first has to go to parliament. Now you could debate long and hard as to which of the two systems is better. In our view, however, no one can say that one is more democratic than the others."

(Minister Tindemans says smilingly that the framers of the constitution of 1830 had a premonition that the Belgians would be among the more emotional nations so that it was understandable for the existing procedures to be introduced. A survey within the European Community is also supposed to have confirmed that the Belgians are more emotional than even the Italians.)



"But that is the constitutional aspect of things in this country, and we have had three major debates on this score and, yes... there have been three votes on it. In 1983 the premier presented the government's position, and here I have once again reviewed all the constitutional and legal arguments for this position, another vote has been taken, the majority of the parliament has accepted it, and even the best legal mind in the opposition has stated that he agreed in principle. The foreign press, however, has not picked up on the fact that we have held these debates, and now people are surprised that the decision has been made and that we went to parliament only after the fact.

"The thing that is arousing criticism here and there is the fact that the missiles were flown in immediately; that they were actually being deployed while the debate was being held. Look. I have no comment on this. The government's decision was announced, the Council of Ministers had made the decision which was immediately (that same night) communicated to the American Embassy in a note, and notification was sent to NATO, to Lord Carrington. And yes, as of that moment, ...the Americans decided to fly them in. The nuclear warheads were on the West Coast, the aircraft, the Galaxies, on the East Coast, and then 24 hours later they were here. Would it have been better psychologically to wait until after the debate in the chamber? I leave that up to you to decide."

[Question] "When you look at the reaction of, among others, people on the street in Brussels, I would say 'yes'."

[Answer] "Yes, that's true. Now I will bring up one thing, and that I will leave up to your judgment: in what straits would we have been if the government had made the decision, first, and it had been rejected by parliament?"

(Silence) "Without the missiles being here? Bringing them over then, after parliament had rejected the idea, would have created tremendous problems."

[Question] "I see what you mean. But I can also imagine the opposition saying: the fact that pressure tactics were used is something that people don't like very much."

[Answer] "We argued the constitutional issue, three times. Should we have done otherwise? We are on sound legal and constitutional grounds, and otherwise we would have been on very slippery grounds because, in point of fact, it [deployment] would have been halted after a negative vote." (Silence) "That's how it is? Isn't it? You do see that, don't you? You can argue whether it was a good idea or not, but I just want to explain how it happened and that it was not as arbitrary as some people think."

"I know, for example, that the NRC HANDELSBLAD sharply criticized the action, but I just want to explain one thing about the constitutional aspect, about the three debates that we had. The government was, of course, of the view: 'The debate is over, we held it and there is no problem.' That was this the view."

"I can easily imagine what would have happened if it had turned out differently, that is, if it hadn't worked. But at the same time I can understand the objections."

"But the problems are more psychological than legal or constitutional in nature."

[Question] "This remark brings me to the last question, which pertains to all of NATO. To what extent is it still possible to keep the alliance together in the way that the leaders want if there is not a sufficient consensus among the public to allow the governments to do so? If you look at the kinds of machinations that the Governments of Belgium and Holland are having to go through to meet their commitments to their allies, how long can they keep it up."

[Answer] "That is the most difficult and serious question that anyone can ask right now. During the last debate I again quoted Clausewitz, who said: 'In order to counter aggression, you have to have the people behind you.' I am convinced that in my country the vast majority of the people want to stay in NATO. But just explaining the complex problem of the missiles is extremely difficult. If you give certain figures, someone else will come along with different ones. It is pretty hard for the common man to get a clear picture of the situation."

Minister Tindemans argues that there is an out-and-out anti-NATO core to the anti-missile movement, but: "As far as I am concerned, there is no substitute for the Atlantic Alliance. Since Belgium was founded in 1830, it has been searching for allies--it has no natural borders, it is open on all sides and has been occupied twice--and since 1949 we have found such allies in the Atlantic Alliance. Even according to the Washington Declaration, its weapons are to be used for defensive purposes. We see no substitute for the Atlantic Alliance, and this must be explained much more clearly, especially to young people."

Photo Caption: Leo Tindemans... Talk with Gromyko

Last week, after a long overnight debate, the Belgian Government survived the debate in the chamber on its deployment of the cruise missiles. EW talked to Minister of Foreign Affairs Leo Tindemans about his visit with Gromyko, the role of Holland in the missile issue, and the hurried manner in which deployment in Belgium ultimately took place.

CSO: 5200/2580

## CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

### RESULTS OF RECENT STOCKHOLM CDE SESSION SUMMED UP

#### Grinevskiy Interview

LD221335 Moscow TASS in English 1310 GMT 22 Mar 85

[Text] Stockholm March 22 TASS--A regular round of the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and on Disarmament in Europe ended here today.

Summing up the results of the past session, the leader of the Soviet delegation, Oleg Grinevskiy, has said in an interview with a TASS correspondent that discussion which was held in the working groups made it possible to consider more deeply both political and military confidence-building measures. However, the conference proved unable to start talks in the full sense of the word.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries, for their part, did their utmost for the work of the conference to proceed in a businesslike manner. A broad response has been roused by the Soviet Union's proposal, which is based on the joint initiatives of socialist countries, on the basic provisions of a treaty on nonuse of military force. The proposal became the pivot of the political discussion at the conference. The awareness of the need to give the most binding character to the principle of nonuse of force increasingly penetrates the political fabric of the talks. The point now is to embody this major international obligation in exact wordings.

Socialist countries also suggest that the elaboration of confidence-building measures in the military field be started, of more considerable in character and broader-in-scope ones as compared with the measures which are provided for by the Final Act of the Helsinki conference and which are already in effect. They also put forward proposals with initiatives of these matters.

However, the businesslike rhythm of the Stockholm conference is being hampered by the nonconstructive stand of the United States and some NATO countries. Throughout the session they were staging a farce of introducing the same proposals now separately, now together. This took two months, although the tense situation in Europe, the continuing deployment of U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles there, and the arms race urgently call for taking measures without delay to lessen the danger of military confrontation and to strengthen European security.

The NATO proposals do not contain anything new. Like before, they are aimed at revealing the military activities of the Warsaw Treaty countries and at gaining one-sided military advantages. Like before, they do not meet the requirements of the equality of rights and equal respect for security. Those proposals do not take into account anywhere and in anything the considerations which were expressed by socialist and nonaligned states.

It is not a secret to anyone that under discussion in Stockholm are complex problems which involve the sensitive aspects of security. Success can be achieved only if measures which are being suggested do not pursue the aim of gaining one-sided advantages of any kind. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries are ready for honest and equal talks. One would like our partners for the talks to understand the Soviet Union's stand and reciprocate. Then agreement will become possible. Next session of the conference is to begin on May 14.

#### Grinevskiy Press Briefing

LD291038 Moscow TASS in English 1032 GMT 29 Mar 85

["Briefing at the Press Center of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR"--TASS headline]

[TEXT] Moscow March 29 TASS -- "The transfer of the center of gravity of the discussion to the working groups has made it possible to consider in greater detail both political and military confidence measures. At the same time to this very day the Stockholm forum still has not managed to move from the exchange of speeches to practical negotiations", said Oleg Grinevskiy, head of the delegation of the USSR to the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. He spoke at a briefing for Soviet and foreign newsmen in Moscow.

Analysing the reasons for that, Oleg Grinevskiy said that the Soviet Union, socialist countries had in every way promoted a situation whereby the conference would proceed in a businesslike vein and adopt major and effective measures which really could improve the political climate in Europe. This is what the entire wide range of their proposals on confidence and security building measures in Europe is aimed at, Grinevskiy emphasized.

Wide response has been evoked by the Soviet Union's proposal, based on the initiative of socialist countries, on fundamental provisions of a treaty on non-use of military force. That proposal has become the core of the political discussion at the conference, Grinevskiy went on to say. The realization of the need to impart the maximum binding character to the principle of non-use of force is increasingly finding its way into the political tissue of the talks. The task now is to embody that important international commitment into precise formulas.

The socialist countries, said the head of the Soviet delegation to the Stockholm Conference, propose to get down to the development of confidence measures in the military field -- measures, more substantial in character and wider in scope -- compared with the measures already in effect as stipulated by the Helsinki Final Act. Initiatives have been submitted by them on those questions as well.

However, Grinevskiy went on to say, the unconstructive position of the United States and some NATO countries disrupts the working rhythm of the Stockholm Conference. For



the duration of an entire session they staged a farce of submitting the very same proposals, first one by one, then all together. This took two months, although the tense situation in Europe, the continuing deployment of U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles there, the arms race imperatively demand urgent actions to lessen the threat of nuclear confrontation and to promote European security.

Oleg Grinevskiy noted that NATO proposals contained nothing new. As before, they were directed at uncovering the military activities of the Warsaw Treaty countries and winning unilateral military advantages. As before, they do not meet the demands of equality of rights and equal respect for security. Nowhere and not in a single aspect do these proposals take account of considerations voiced by socialist and nonaligned states.

The Soviet Union is firmly convinced that the present crucial phase of development of the situation in Europe demands that the atmosphere of trust and cooperation be created. The course of events at the Stockholm forum raises the question of prospects for strengthening peace. The Soviet Union, socialist countries are ready for such talks on an honest and equal basis. We would like our partners in the talks to understand the position of the Soviet Union and respond in kind. Then agreement will be possible, Oleg Grinevskiy said in conclusion.

#### Further on Press Briefing

LD291531 Moscow TASS in English 1523 GMT 29 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow March 29 TASS -- The Soviet Union's proposal on basic provisions of a treaty on the non-use of military force, based on the joint initiatives of socialist countries, evoked far-ranging responses at the Stockholm conference, Oleg Grinevskiy, the leader of the Soviet delegation to the Stockholm conference, said in answer to journalists' questions. "We tried to take account in our proposal of the considerations and ideas put forward both by neutral and non-aligned countries and by NATO members. To this end the Soviet Union proposed that the treaty include the commitment to hold emergency consultations, make inquiries and supply relevant information in the case of a danger of war and use of armed force," the leader of the Soviet delegation stressed.

Touching upon the reaction of the United States to the proposal to ban the use of military force, Oleg Grinevskiy noted that the Western countries led by the USA claimed even at the beginning of the conference that it was not a proper venue for the consideration of that problem. Eventually, however, they had to admit that it was logical to raise that question. Not a single participant in the conference is now against the examination of this initiative of socialist countries. However, Western delegates only discuss the possibility of a mere reiteration of the principle of the non-use of force as it is formulated in the U.N. Charter and in the Helsinki Final Act, and even that in the context of unilateral confidence-building measures proposed by them. If we write the U.S.-proposed formula as an equation, there will be zero on one side and the entire package of the NATO proposals on the other. This is not a serious approach to talks, Oleg Grinevskiy stressed.

Especially important in the present-day international situation, given the aggravated threat of nuclear war, is attached to the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, Oleg Grinevskiy pointed out. The USSR assumed this obligation. If its example were emulated by the other nuclear powers participating in the conference, mainly by the USA, Britain and France, a turn would be made towards stronger trust and towards lessening the risks of armed confrontation in Europe from the point of view of its most important aspect, the threat of nuclear attack.



Neither the USA nor the other NATO nuclear powers dared oppose that proposal. However, they tried to remove that question from the agenda under the pretext that the mandate of the Stockholm conference ruled out debates on problems relevant to nuclear weapons. The leader of the Soviet delegation noted that in reality not a single line of that mandate prevented examination of that most important problem of our time. The point is that the West fears lest that proposal subvert the concept underlying NATO's doctrine of nuclear warfare.

Restrictions on the scope of military exercises, which sometimes are so large that one can hardly tell them from troop deployments for actual combat operations, will also play an important role from the point of view of lessening the threat of war in the present-day situation, Oleg Grinevskiy continued. For instance, the NATO "Autumn Forge" military exercises last year involved more than 300,000 troops. This fact causes special worry among many neutral and non-aligned countries. In view of this circumstance, the delegations of Bulgaria, the GDR and the USSR thought it necessary to table at the conference a document suggesting a ceiling of 40,000 troops on the scope of military exercises.

Describing the political atmosphere around the Stockholm conference, Oleg Grinevskiy said: "The Reagan administration's course of carrying through its 'star wars' programme and the continued deployments of U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles in Europe constitute a poor backdrop for the proceedings of the Conference on Confidence-Building Measures."

#### IZVESTIYA Commentary

PM281654 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Mar 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by A. Sychev, IZVESTIYA correspondent, under the rubric "The Day's Events": "To Seek Mutually Acceptable Solutions. At the Stockholm Conference"]

[Text] Stockholm -- The latest session of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe has ended its work. The importance of the forum's tasks and the imperative need to solve them stem from the tense situation prevailing in Europe and throughout the world, from the ever increasing nuclear threat. This is precisely why the work of the Stockholm Conference has been followed intently by the European and world public.

It is well known that at the previous session, the conference participants reached an agreement to set up two working groups to examine submitted proposals on an equal basis. In the opinion of most participants, this made it possible to move on to a more active stage of the talks.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have persistently advocated that the conference's work be held in a businesslike vein. Exceptionally great importance is attached to the document "Basic Provisions of a Treaty on the Mutual Nonuse of Military Force and Maintenance of Relations of Peace" submitted by the Soviet Union.

The socialist countries' proposals are formulated within the framework of the requirement of equal respect for the security interests of all states participating in the conference and provide a sound basis for conducting the talks on a practical rather than purely verbal basis; they make a weighty contribution to normalizing the situation in Europe. For example, the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force would be an important step toward the creation of real confidence among states.

The political and legal affirmation of this principle among a wide group of countries would render it an effective and obligatory rule of international life.

Special significance in today's complex situation attaches also to the proposal put forward by the socialist countries on limiting the scale of military exercises in Europe and its contiguous sea and air space. Both at previous sessions and the latest one, the constructive proposals by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries did not meet with the due response from the delegations of the North Atlantic bloc member-countries. As before, they applied the tactics of procrastination, stubbornly trying to force a discussion on their own "package" of proposals concerning military-technical measures and postponing discussion of the socialist countries' initiative until later, so to speak.

At the end of the current session, the NATO countries introduced a new document which in fact contains nothing new. The 18-page document, which they have christened "SC-1 Expanded Version," brings together provisions submitted a whole year ago.

The NATO countries are placing special emphasis on the so-called "transparency" concept -- in other words, obtaining extensive information of military significance -- which they present at the only measure of trust between states worth any attention.

Yet, you only have to recall the "strike in depth" doctrine adopted by the NATO Military Planning Committee, and all that remains of the universality of the "transparency" concept is the desire to obtain information needed to plan offensive operations against a large group of states represented at the conference. There can be even less confidence if the "transparency," according to NATO's proposal, excludes troop contingents stationed in the United States and on U.S. bases but meant to be used in Europe.

Although the work of the fifth session, which has just ended, failed to mark the start of constructive talks, the conference -- and this opinion is shared by many delegations -- did make headway in its work. All participants concretized their proposals, and the starting material on the basis of which mutually acceptable final documents can and must be elaborated was determined.

The idea of the need to combine political and military confidence-building measures is encountering increasing understanding and support among participants in the forum. Only on the basis of this approach will it be possible to achieve a real strengthening of security in Europe.

#### PRAVDA Commentary

PM021019 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Apr 85 First Edition p 6

[Article by M. Kostikov, PRAVDA correspondent: "Components of Confidence. At the Stockholm Conference"]

[Text] Stockholm, March--The fifth session of the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe has concluded its work in the Swedish capital. During the session the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries graphically demonstrated their desire to embark on concrete and businesslike talks not just in words but in actual fact. Right from the start of the Stockholm conference's work, the socialist countries have regarded of paramount importance major questions of a political and military nature, on whose resolution the reduction of the danger of war in Europe and a shift toward a significant improvement in the entire situation on the continent really depend.

On the very first working day of the latest session of the Stockholm conference, the USSR advanced an important initiative on the basis of the Warsaw Pact states' common position by submitting the "Basic Provisions of a Treaty on the Mutual Nonuse of Military Force and the Maintenance of Relations of Peace."

On the very first working day of the latest session of the Stockholm conference, the USSR advanced an important initiative on the basis of the Warsaw Pact states' common position by submitting the "Basic Provisions of a Treaty on the Mutual Nonuse of Military Force and the Maintenance of Relations of Peace."

What do the socialist countries propose? The adoption of a pledge not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional arms against each other and, thus, not to use military force against each other at all. This is the crux of the proposed treaty. A whole number of provisions are envisaged, which really accord with the vital security interests of all people. Such a treaty also proposes the nonuse of force against third countries and the taking of effective measures to prevent a space arms race, to end the race for both nuclear and conventional arms, to limit and reduce arms, and to achieve disarmament on the basis of the principle of equality of rights, balance, reciprocity, and identical respect for security interests. Such important pledges are essentially the chief components in achieving confidence, security, and broad international cooperation on the continent.

Developing the Helsinki accords, the socialist countries advanced a proposal to limit the scale of military exercises in Europe and the adjacent sea (ocean) region and airspace to a level not exceeding 40,000 men. Indeed, in recent years the European Continent has become an arena for large-scale NATO "games" involving hundreds of thousands of servicemen and the use of a vast quantity of all kinds of modern combat hardware. Here maneuvers of this kind, which embrace territories from the north to the south of the continent, follow one after another -- this is hardly distinguishable from constant preparations to deploy armed forces to wage combat operations -- and pose a real threat to states' security.

The American-NATO approach to resolving the problems facing the participants in this representative forum still does not relate to their very essence or their initial cause or touch in practice on questions of limiting the level and scale of military activity. The very loudly and widely publicized "package" of proposals submitted by the NATO countries pursues the same old self-seeking aim: to achieve military superiority for the United States and NATO by hook or by crook, overtly or covertly. It is no coincidence that this "package" only contains military-technical measures aimed, supposedly, at increasing "transparency" in military activity on the continent but, in point of fact, at revealing the structure of the Armed Forces of the USSR and its allies and legalizing monitoring of their daily activities. This would be an additional broad channel for military intelligence and for gathering information on the Warsaw Pact countries' defense capability.

The NATO countries submitted for examination by this conference session a detailed document on exchanging preliminary plans for states' military activity in Europe. In practice this merely develops their notorious "transparency" concept and in no way leads to a reduction in the danger of military confrontation on the continent, the most important condition for creating an atmosphere of confidence. The "package" of NATO proposals to exchange military information provides for data to be supplied on the location of individual divisions, staffs, regiments, and other groups and subunits of troops. It is significant that this kind of Western "confidence-building measure" is also supplemented by the NATO proposal to check or inspect them, which pursues the same old aim of analyzing the Warsaw Pact countries' defense potential.

While preaching the need to implement such measures of "broad openness" in military activity in Europe, above all with regard to the socialist countries, Washington in no way extends them to its own territory. This kind of "confidence" accords neither with the strengthening of security nor, still less, with the principles of equality and non-detriment to either side. The very act of once again putting forward deliberately unacceptable proposals is nothing but an attempt to lead the forum's work into an impasse.

At the same time, if we take the large-scale political measures proposed by the USSR, which include, in addition to the treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace, steps such as a pledge by the nuclear powers not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, Europe's liberation from chemical weapons, and the cutting of military budgets, the United States takes an overtly obstructionist stand on all these questions. Nor does Washington intend to discuss the question connected with creating nuclear-free zones on the continent, which is a very important confidence-building measure in Europe, in which a whole series of European countries are interested.

Analyzing the course of the work of the Stockholm forum and its present session and meeting and talking with representatives of different countries, you become quite aware of the existence of barriers in the way of reaching an accord -- both barriers which are sometimes erected artificially, and quite objective barriers which depend directly on the complexity of the present international situation and the continuing policy of military confrontation being pursued by the United States.

However, the work of the Stockholm conference is not standing still. The countries participating in the forum are drawing closer both in time and in essence to talks on the whole range of problems facing them, as indicated by the start made on the activities of the two working groups set up at the conference. Of course substantial results can be achieved in Stockholm, but only if certain conference participants abandon their attempts to secure unilateral advantages.

L. Petrov, head of the Bulgarian delegation, believes that the conference can and must make a real contribution to the work begun by the Helsinki All-European Conference. The USSR's major initiatives, including the "Main Provisions of a Treaty on the Mutual Nonuse of Military Force and the Maintenance of Relations of Peace," he pointed out, follow the channel of developing the Helsinki accords, and their implementation is a vitally important question for Europe's peaceful future. At the same time, the socialist countries' proposals provide an opportunity to verify the West's attitude in practice and their own real desire to improve the situation on the continent.

In the Polish delegation's opinion, its leader W. Komarski said in an interview with PRAVDA's correspondent, the USSR's initiative accords with the interests of the majority of the countries participating in the conference's work, including certain European NATO states. The U.S. side has still not displayed any interest in this, although last year Washington's official spokesmen repeatedly declared the importance of starting talks on the nonuse of force.

As for the N and N group (neutral and nonaligned countries), their approach to resolving the Stockholm forum's tasks reflects the need to take measures to restrict military activity in Europe. Certain aspects of the position of the states in this group are consonant with the Soviet initiatives. However, as circles in these countries themselves believe, particularly the representatives of Sweden, Austria, and Yugoslavia, they have placed on the conference table merely an initial set of their proposals, which still have to be elaborated in greater detail.



The Stockholm conference is approaching a crucial phase. The specific proposals submitted by the delegations of the USSR and the other Warsaw Pact countries represent a good base for reaching accords on mutually acceptable measures of both a political and a military-technical nature to strengthen security and confidence in Europe. The socialist states expect these proposals, including the "Main Provisions of a Treaty on the Mutual Renunciation of Military Force and the Maintenance of Relations of Peace" submitted by the Soviet Union, to be examined in a constructive spirit. This would open up prospects for substantial progress in the work of the Stockholm forum and would promote the achievement of a genuine atmosphere of confidence in strengthening security and the transition to disarmament in Europe -- that is, everything toward which 33 European states, the United States, and Canada paved the way by signing the Helsinki accords almost 10 years ago.

CSO: 3200/1068



CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

ISRAELYAN, OTHER DELEGATES QUOTED ON SPACE, CHEMICAL ARMS

LD042001 Moscow TASS in English 1947 GMT 4 Apr 85

[Text] Geneva April 4 TASS -- TASS correspondents Vladimir Bogachev and Yevgeniy Korzhev report:

Attempts of Western delegations, above all of the United States, to prevent under different far-fetched pretexts constructive discussion of measures, aimed at lessening the danger of war give rise to indignation on the part of other participants in the Geneva Conference on Disarmament.

The head of the Indian delegation Muchkund Dubey has said that the tough stand, which was taken at the Geneva negotiations by Western delegations, hampers attainment of progress in the question of prevention of nuclear war and liquidation of the threat of a nuclear catastrophe. The Indian representative pointed to Western speeded up pace in the development of new types of nuclear armaments, plans of conducting "star wars".

Czechoslovakia's representative Milos Veivoda stressed that prevention of militarisation of outer space is one of the most important problems of negotiations on disarmament. If this problem is not resolved now, in a few years' time what will be at issue are systems of weapons deployed in the near-earth space. Milos Veivoda supported the Soviet Union's proposals on prohibition of the use of force in outer space and from outer space with regard to earth, and also from earth with regard to objects in outer space.

The head of the USSR delegation Viktor Israelyan denounced the attempts of Western delegations to hamper solution of the question of prohibition of chemical weapons. He said that Western representatives put forward deliberately unacceptable and unrealistic proposals which could only delay elaboration of a relevant convention. The Soviet delegation, the speaker said, proposes that restrictions be introduced on the production of super toxic deadly chemicals and the most dangerous methyl-phosphoric compounds that can be used in production of binary ammunition, but do not have big application in civilian industry. To exercise verification of the observation of the agreement it is necessary to elaborate such procedures that could not be used for interference into internal affairs of states.

CSO: 5200/1082

## CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

### TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF CBW CONVENTION NOTED

LD090844 Moscow TASS in English 0711 GMT 9 Apr 85

The convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction will be 10 years old on April 10, the day it came into effect. This convention was opened for signature in 1972 simultaneously in Moscow, Washington and London but it entered into force only three years later. At present about 100 states are parties to this convention and over 30 more countries have signed but not yet ratified it.

The states parties to the convention have undertaken never to develop, produce, stockpile, acquire or keep microbiological or other biological agents or toxins, weapons, equipment, means of delivery for using such agents and toxins. It is very important in this connection that participating states have officially proclaimed as their aim to assure an effective prohibition of chemical weapons. They pledged to continue talks to reach in the nearest future an agreement on effective measures for banning the development, production and stockpiling of such weapons and for their destruction.

Practice shows, however, that the United States, for instance, far from seeking elimination of chemical weapons, is developing new types of such weapons, intended for mass destruction of people. The development and testing of potent binary nerve toxic agents and the training of troops in the use of such agents are under way in the USA. Thus under the U.S. budget for the 1986 fiscal year the White House intends to spend 1.3 billion dollars on a chemical rearmament program. Over 151 million dollars are requested, for instance, for the production of binary artillery shells and air bombs.

In January this year General Rogers, supreme allied commander in Europe, stated frankly that the United States finds it necessary to produce and emplace nerve gas shells for "possible use by the NATO forces in Europe."

But the American strategists do not limit the geography of a possible chemical war to the European Continent. Early in February this year units of American Marines, stationed in Japan, held in Okinawa exercises to practice in combat operations involving the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons. And the United States is intensively preparing for such a war.

According to the magazine NATION the U.S. Armed Forces intend to spend 1.4 million dollars on building a special laboratory for testing bacteriological weapons at the Dagway Proving Ground (Utah State). It is planned to experiment with microbes causing

dangerous diseases in humans. In its directives to the Armed Forces of the USA for 1985-1989 the Pentagon sets them the task of getting ready for a quick use of chemical weapons.

Facts go to show that while professing support for a ban on chemical weapons the United States is in fact sabotaging the efforts to reach an international agreement on this problem and is preparing for chemical warfare.

CSO: 5200/1086

## NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

### USSR ARMY PAPER URGES NORTH EUROPE NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE

PM101510 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Mar 85 Second Edition p 3

[Article by D. Pogorzelskiy under the rubric "Policy of Peace Against Policy of War": "Nuclear-Free Status for Northern Europe"]

[Text] Increasingly large numbers of people are becoming aware that NATO's militarist preparations in Europe are posing a threat to peace and stability in the continent. In this connection peace-loving forces are making active efforts against the aggressive intentions of the United States and its closest allies in the North Atlantic Bloc.

The creation of entire geographical zones where nuclear weapons must be neither produced nor deployed has a considerable role to play among measures that could improve the situation in Europe and strengthen security. The idea of turning northern Europe into a nuclear-free zone and thus reducing the nuclear threat for peoples in that region was put forward as far back as 1963. At that time the USSR had already declared its positive attitude toward the idea.

Nowadays the problem of proclaiming northern Europe a nuclear-free zone has acquired particular political overtones. It is actively discussed not only by the broadest strata of the public but also within the walls of parliaments in north European countries. And this is no accident. The deployment of first-strike U.S. nuclear weapons on the European Continent and the cruise missile flight paths charted over the territory of Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland have posed a direct nuclear threat for the populations of these countries.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it has repeatedly stated its readiness to act as a guarantor of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe and examine the question of certain measures -- the essential measures, at that -- applicable to its own territory contiguous to that zone, which would help consolidate its nuclear-free status.

In particular the USSR would be prepared to discuss with the interested sides the question of granting nuclear-free status to the waters of the Baltic Sea.

The USSR has unilaterally pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. It is also prepared to pledge not to use nuclear weapons against north European states which join the nuclear-free zone. In other words, states which renounce the production, acquisition, and deployment of nuclear weapons on their territory. It is hardly necessary to adduce proof that the creation of the zone would be much more meaningful for all its members if similar pledges were to be given by NATO's nuclear powers.

The USSR's stance enjoys the ardent support and approval of the broadest strata of the public in northern Europe and even the entire continent. Many eminent politicians emphasize that this stance is an alternative to nuclear madness, since a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe could make an important contribution to freeing the whole continent of nuclear weapons, both tactical and medium-range. S. Ornhoi, Norwegian Storting (parliament) deputy from the Socialist Left Party, for example, described the Soviet Union's latest peace initiatives as "positive and exceptionally important," while P. Eriksson, secretary of the Swedish National Committee for the Defense of Peace, emphasized: "The USSR has again convincingly displayed its desire for a constructive solution of the problems of strengthening security in northern Europe."

What is it, however, that obstructs the materialization of this productive idea? Or is it only a utopia, a "sand castle," as the West German newspaper DIE WELT recently put it, instead of a way to strengthen security in Europe?

The point is that the very idea of creating a north European nuclear-free zone causes a painful reaction in Washington and among the North Atlantic bloc's leadership. The Finnish newspaper SUOMENMAA was correct in writing recently, when assessing the attitude of Atlanticists toward the problem of a nuclear-free north, that "the basic obstacle to the materialization of this proposal is the stance of the United States and its NATO allies, according to which no NATO state can proclaim itself nuclear-free or prevent the use of nuclear weapons on its territory by NATO in the event of a conflict situation arising."

In the opinion of American strategists, the refusal by NATO's northern members to allow the introduction of nuclear weapons on their territory in wartime would undermine the "flexible response" strategy and the concept of nuclear "deterrence." And they are supposedly the cornerstones of NATO doctrine.

Other arguments are also advanced to "justify" the temporizing stance by the north European NATO countries' ruling circles in the nuclear-free zone dialogue. They declare, for example, that the creation of a nuclear-free zone would increase the threat of nuclear war (?!). This premise simply does not hold water. In their attempts to justify their stance to the progressive public, the opponents of the nuclear-free zone are simply resorting to illicit methods when they claim that Denmark's and Norway's inclusion in a nuclear-free zone would "limit" their "freedom of action" in the political arena.

The following subterfuge is also used: The question of the zone must be discussed only within the alliance's framework in order to obtain the approval of the Atlantic partners. But NATO's attitude is well known. They are thus engineering an "artificial offside." The following argument is adduced: There are no nuclear weapons on Danish or Norwegian territory now, and there is nothing to be legalized by a treaty or agreement.

But the actual point at issue is to ensure that such weapons never appear either in Denmark or in Norway. It is, after all, well known that arms and ammunition depots for NATO strike formations designed to perform the most varied roles are being created on the territory of these countries.

What can be said about these "arguments?" When someone is unwilling to do something, he can always find a pretext for not doing it. An agreement by the aggressive Western forces, striving for military superiority over the USSR and the Warsaw Pact, to create a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe would in fact mean abandoning their adventurous plans in that region. Unwilling to openly admit this, the Atlanticists are seeking pretexts to steer the question of the nuclear-free north away from practical discussions. But they will not succeed in deceiving the peoples.



Pressure by the peace-loving movement in northern Europe struggling for the proclamation of a nuclear-free zone in the region is continuing to grow. Millions of Swedes, Finns, Danes, Icelanders, and Norwegians are demanding that specific measures be implemented to grant nuclear-free status to northern Europe. Much attention in the region's countries focused on the results of CPSU Central Committee extraordinary plenum, which stressed the continuity of the strategic line elaborated by the 26th CPSU Congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums. The Soviet Union's unbending resolve to preserve and strengthen peace, and its readiness to maintain good-neighborly relations with all countries on the principles of peaceful coexistence and on the basis of equality and mutually advantageous cooperation correspond to the aspirations of peoples in northern Europe and of all mankind, and inspire them with hope and emancipation from the nuclear threat.

CSO: 5200/1079

## NUCLEAR TESTING

### U.S. CONTINUES NUCLEAR TESTING DESPITE UN APPEAL

LD092206 Moscow TASS in English 2143 GMT 9 Apr 85

[Text] New York April 9 TASS -- Despite an appeal of the U.N. General Assembly for an immediate end on nuclear weapons tests, the United States continues underground nuclear explosions. It had been officially announced that last Saturday another nuclear explosion, the fourth this year, with a yield of 20 kt was carried out at the Nevada testing range. Last year the United States exploded a total of 14 underground nuclear devices, which testifies to the intensive development by the Pentagon of new types of deadly weapons and to the improvement of the existing nuclear arms arsenals.

This also explains why Washington has not yet put into effect the treaties concluded by it with the Soviet Union in 1974 and 1976 on the limitation of underground nuclear weapons tests and on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. The Soviet side has repeatedly offered the USA to ratify those treaties but Washington is still refusing to do so.

Washington actually thwarted the tripartite talks of the USSR, USA and Britain to work out a treaty on the universal and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. It is as a consequence of the dramatic tilt of the present U.S. Administration towards the nuclear arms race that the talks were unilaterally broken off by the West.

The Soviet Union suggested almost 5 years ago a moratorium on all nuclear testing so as to contribute to the early conclusion of a treaty on the universal and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests. But the United States did not accept that proposal as it wished to have a free hand for the further stockpiling of nuclear armaments.

On December 12, 1984, the 39th Session of the U.N. General Assembly voted overwhelmingly to approve a resolution expressing the will of the world community for an immediate end to all nuclear testing. Carrying on underground nuclear explosions, the United States is demonstrating its unwillingness to respect the will of the peoples of the world.

CSO: 5200/1081

## NUCLEAR TESTING

### KRASNAYA ZVEZDA DENIES TEST BAN VIOLATIONS

PM251525 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Mar 85 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Colonel A. Fedorov under the rubric "Facts Against Lies": "Shifting the Blame"]

[Text] In the U.S. capital people continue to dwell on the question of alleged Soviet violations of nuclear test treaties. Although Washington does not have and cannot have any evidence of this, the question was brought up again in a recently published report by President R. Reagan to Congress.

What is the purpose of this malicious slander? First and foremost, to sow doubts about the sincerity of the Soviet stance on banning nuclear weapon tests. But this stance is clear and unequivocal. It envisages the immediate resumption of the talks broken off by the United States in 1980 on elaborating a treaty on the total and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests and the entry into force, through ratification, of the previously concluded Soviet-American treaties on limiting underground nuclear weapon tests (1974) and on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes (1976).

This constructive Soviet line has found extensive support in the United Nations and among the peaceloving public in most countries, including the United States itself. But there has been no response to the Soviet stance from the U.S. administration. It does not want to resume the talks. Nor does it want to ratify the 1974 and 1976 treaties. This is the second reason for the appearance of official Washington's fabrications. Their purpose is clear--to whitenash its unseemly stance on the question of banning nuclear tests and to justify its line of wrecking the existing accords.

It is many years now since the aforementioned treaties were signed, and all this time the U.S. administration has been coming up with farfetched excuses for not ratifying them. It is now talking about the need to review these accords, allegedly because it is impossible to monitor their observance, but this excuse is thoroughly false and hypocritical. Provisions on effective monitoring, which will come into force the moment the sides exchange ratification instruments, are contained in both of the aforementioned treaties, but they have not been tested in practice solely because of the White House's obstructionist line. The question here is by no means monitoring, but the U.S. ruling circles' policy, a policy of arms race and unbridled buildup of arsenals of more and more types and varieties of nuclear weapons. Washington's refusal to

ratify the treaties is actually fear of the entry into force of the clear-cut and effective monitoring system envisaged by them.

The desire to distract attention from their own gross violations of treaty obligations by means of malicious insinuations and to shift the blame onto someone else is another reason for the fabrications directed at the USSR.

Our country always has unswervingly fulfilled and is fulfilling its international agreements. Washington has no reason to doubt that the Soviet Union will keep its word and not take any steps incompatible with the provisions of the treaties on nuclear tests.

It is indicative that even in the United States a number of authoritative institutions are convinced that the USSR has not exceeded the agreed threshold of 150 kilotons in carrying out its nuclear tests. This fact, THE WASHINGTON POST writes, is confirmed by geophysicists at Colombia and Colorado Universities and by the U.S. Geological Administration. "None of the Russians' biggest test explosions in the last 5 years have exceeded the set level," leading U.S. seismologist L. Sykes said. This is also the conclusion of a special study by the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, commissioned, incidentally, by the U.S. Defense Department.

As for Washington's stance on the question of observance of commitments under the 1974 and 1976 treaties, it was assessed by the Soviet Union in a memorandum handed to the U.S. side in January 1984. It says, in part, that despite the assurances that have been given, the United States is evidently continuing to exceed the maximum permitted yield for test charges.

Competent Soviet organs have repeatedly drawn attention to cases of discharge of radioactive substances outside U.S. national territory as a result of U.S. underground nuclear explosions, which is a violation of the 1963 treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water.

The hypocritical pose of "accuser" adopted by representatives of the U.S. administration fools no one. The U.S. reluctance to hold talks on the total and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests and its refusal to ratify the 1974 and 1976 treaties speak for themselves. The prospect of the cessation or maximum limitation of nuclear weapon tests scares the current U.S. administration, since it sees this a serious obstacle to the implementation of its large-scale program for the buildup of nuclear arms.

Against this background the U.S. side's efforts to discredit the USSR's honest and responsible approach to the fulfillment of its treaty commitments are totally futile.

CSO: 5200/1058

END

**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

28 MAY 85